

THE

SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 4, 1876.

CURRENT TOPICS.

WE UNDERSTAND that the Lincoln's-Inn division of the Court of Appeal during the present sittings will consist of Lord Justice James, Sir R. Baggallay, and Sir G. Bramwell.

THE PROFOUND SECRET in which judicial appointments are nowadays enveloped may to some extent account for the joyous greeting with which on Thursday the public in Westminster Hall received Mr. Hawkins. It was a relief after a period of doubt and bewilderment to see in the judicial procession the best possible confirmation of the rumour of the new appointment. But there are more substantial reasons for congratulation, for the marvellous quickness of apprehension and great experience of the new judge will add strength of a very important kind to the bench. Yesterday in the best-informed legal circles the belief prevailed that one of the leaders of the Western Circuit had accepted the other vacant puisne judgeship, but until the new judge has been let down from the clouds and exhibited to vulgar gaze it is unwise to hazard an opinion as to the merits of the appointment.

THE DEATH is announced of one who for nearly twenty years occupied a seat on the bench at Lincoln's-inn. It will be long before Sir John Stuart's characteristics fade out of the memory of the equity bar. During a considerable part of his career he was far from being a popular judge; he took no pains, indeed, to acquire popularity. On petition and motion days he was not always attentive or obliging; too often he was rough and rude. He was not always patient and receptive to argument; he was not unaccustomed to take the bit in his teeth and to run away with his first impressions of a case, and, as a necessary consequence, his judgments somewhat frequently came to grief on appeal. But he was inaccessible to flattery; he was in the highest degree upright and fearless; and he hunted down fraud and malpractice with unceasing vigilance. Many of his judgments, too, were able and learned, and in the case of *Drummond v. Drummond* (14 W. R. 829), where he held, in defiance of Lord Westbury's decisions in *Cookney v. Anderson* (11 W. R. 628) and *Foley v. Maillardet* (12 W. R. 355), that the Court of Chancery had jurisdiction to direct service of process abroad, his judgment was upheld on appeal by Lord Chelmsford and Lord Justice Turner. In course of time, when

his merits came to be understood, he gained genuine esteem, which, when he retired from the bench, found vent in a demonstration by the bar of a kind which was not then very usual. Since he left the bench his appearances in public have been chiefly in the columns of the *Times*, where, it will be remembered, about two years ago he advocated the establishment of a new Vice-Chancellor and staff as a sovereign remedy for the abuses in bankruptcy—"vices," as he called them, "introduced by the Act of Lord Brougham." Sir John Stuart believed in the Court of Chancery, and did not adore Lord Brougham.

THE ORDERS of the House of Lords under the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, which we print in another column, introduce some changes in the previous procedure. By ord. 1 the time for appealing is limited to one year from the date of the judgment appealed from. Under the order of 1725 (No. 118) the limit for petitions of appeal was two years from the enrolment of the decree. Ord. 4 requires the recognizance to be for the penalty of £500, instead of the £400 required by the order of 1829 (No. 61), and in addition two sureties are to enter into a joint and several bond for £200, or to pay that sum into the account of the fee fund of the House of Lords. Ord. 5 requires the printed case in an English appeal to be lodged at the Parliament office within six weeks from the presentation of the appeal, instead of being delivered to the Clerk of the Parliaments at least four days before the hearing of the case, as was required by the order of 1724 (No. 117). The appeal is to be set down for hearing on the first sitting day after the expiration of the six weeks, and on default by the appellant the appeal is to stand dismissed. By ord. 6 the time for presenting cross-appeals is the same time as for lodging cases in the original appeal. Under the order of 1763 the cross-appeal was to be presented within a fortnight after the answer to the original appeal. Ord. 10, as to taxation of costs, is in substance the same as the order of 1835, but it provides that the Clerk of the Parliaments or clerk-assistant shall, on the application of either party, appoint such person as he shall think fit to tax the costs, and the person so appointed may tax and ascertain the amount, and report it to the clerk.

AMONG THE MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS contained in the Appellate Jurisdiction Act is the enactment in section 19 that a judge of the High Court who has attended as a member of the Court of Appeal under the Judicature

Acts shall, after the expiration of the period during which his attendance was requested, attend the judgment or final decision of any case argued before him during such period; but there is no corresponding provision requiring the judges who have been recently transferred to the Court of Appeal to adjudicate on cases heard by them as members of the High Court. The full court which devoted so large a proportion of the last Trinity Sittings to the re-hearing of the *Franconia* case, will, therefore, lose the judgments of Sir G. Bramwell, Sir W. B. Brett, and Sir R. P. Amphlett, and the prodigious expenditure of judicial power in hearing the case will be so far thrown away. It is to be regretted that the Appellate Jurisdiction Act did not contain a clause repealing section 47 of the Judicature Act, 1873, and altering the constitution of the Court of Criminal Appeal. Now that three is the quorum, not only for the Court of Appeal, but even for the House of Lords, it is difficult to see why five judges are the smallest number that can be trusted with the decision of a case reserved by a chairman of quarter sessions. The reduction of the numbers of the court from five to three would diminish the chance of difference of opinion, but it might be convenient to enact that in the event of such difference arising (or in any case by the special leave of the court) the point in question should be submitted to the Court of Appeal.

THE REPORT of the proceedings before the new Wreck Commission Court, which we print in another column, furnishes an instructive commentary on the remarks we lately made upon the rules for Board of Trade inquiries into shipping casualties. One of the difficulties we pointed out as likely to arise, viz., the want of any provision in the rules for an opening statement, presented itself at the very outset of the case, and the commissioner felt himself obliged to ask the counsel for the Board of Trade to assist the court by giving a short outline of the salient points which the court was asked to take into consideration. But the more important question which, as we suggested, could hardly fail to arise was as to the right of the Board of Trade to put inquisitorial questions to witnesses against whom a charge might afterwards be made. The rules are explicit upon the point that such persons are to be put in the witness box (r. 14). But it was very naturally urged that, although it might be impossible to say that such persons should not be witnesses, yet it was contrary to all the principles of English law to cross-examine a man who might afterwards be condemned on the evidence given by himself under such cross-examination. The commissioner, however, decided that such witnesses might be cross-examined; and on the whole there can be little doubt that he decided rightly. These inquiries are instituted for the purpose of investigating all the circumstances attending the loss; and to prevent the Board of Trade, who are in fact inquisitors on behalf of the public, from putting inquisitorial questions, merely because the case might result in a charge being made, and a penalty being inflicted in the shape of cancellation or suspension of certificate, might thwart the very object for which the inquiry was held. At the same time the rule may occasion great injustice to officers whose conduct may be called in question, and it might be fairer to them to hold the inquiry as a separate matter from the trial of any charge against them. On the other hand, however, the delay and expense might be very much increased thereby.

THE ORDERS FOR THE UNION OF COUNTIES for the purpose of winter assizes have appeared. A dozen places are appointed for the trial of the prisoners committed for trial at assizes during the four months between the beginning of August and the beginning of December in the whole of England and Wales, with the exception only of the Home counties and Durham

and Northumberland, as to which latter counties no order has yet been published. The principle adopted in the union of counties is to form one or more groups out of the counties associated for the purposes of circuits by the Order in Council of the 5th of February last, and to select as the places at which winter assizes are to be held the chief town or towns on each circuit. The result, on the whole, will be reasonably convenient, and where the distance is great—as, for instance, from Carlisle to Manchester—this is compensated for by the probability that very few prisoners will have to be brought. The sheriff of the county in which the trials are to be held is to have the same power as to all matters in relation to the winter assizes as if he were sheriff for the whole of the winter assize county; but he is relieved from the duty of carrying sentences into effect outside his own county, and of levying outside that county fines imposed or recognizances estreated at the winter assizes. Grand and petty jurors are to be summoned exclusively from the county in which the trials are held.

THE LIABILITY OF MASTERS.

AN attempt will doubtless be made next session to bring about legislation with regard to what may be most compendiously described as the doctrine of *Priestly v. Fowler*. It will probably be known to most of our readers that a Bill was brought in last session for the purpose of altering the law in relation to the liability of masters for injuries caused to their servants by the negligence of fellow-servants, and the subject was referred to a select committee, which, being unable to obtain all the evidence they considered desirable during the session, determined to report to the House the evidence which they had obtained, and to recommend that the subject should be further investigated in a future session. The evidence that was laid before the committee was very conflicting, but in truth it was a great deal of it rather the expression of individual opinion than evidence of facts. Among others Mr. Joseph Brown, Q.C., Mr. R. S. Wright, of the common law bar, and Mr. Howell, the well-known trades unionist, were examined. The broad features of the question at issue as discussed by these witnesses are very interesting, inasmuch as the reader's mind is brought down to the very roots of a branch of law, not of a special or exceptional kind, but one which affects the general social relations which must exist between the members of any community. We could not help feeling very often in the course of reading the evidence the same objection to the mode of treating the subject on the part of the witnesses that we ventured some time ago to express to the judgment of the late Mr. Justice Archibald in *Lovell v. Howell* (24 W. R. 672, L. R. 1 C. P. D. 161). The reason of the thing is not sufficiently gone into. The arguments stick in the bark. The tendency of many minds, especially of legal minds, is to think that to have enunciated a conclusion in elaborate phraseology is the same thing as to have given reasons for its existence. The legal reason we are constantly coming upon for the non-liability of a master for the damage occasioned to a servant by the negligence of a fellow-servant engaged in a common employment is that the servant impliedly undertakes to bear the risks which are necessarily incidental to such employment, one of which in common experience is negligence on the part of his fellow-servant. This is a way of stating the law which in the result is tolerably correct, and there is no doubt that the authorities use this mode of expression, but it is obvious that such a proposition is no justification for the existence of such a law, and we will venture to add, for reasons we will give hereafter, that as a mode of expressing the result of the law it is theoretically faulty.

The question that must immediately occur to every

one who is in the habit of reasoning a matter out is—Why is it an implied term of the contract between master and servant that the servant shall take these risks? There is, in fact, no such implication in the minds of the parties. At all events we venture to think that no considerations with reference to the matter in question ever occur to the mind of the servant. The term "implied contract" is one which ought to be very carefully made use of, and is capable of being very easily misapplied. There are no doubt many cases where terms of contract really are implied. There are cases in which there is an understanding not expressed in words, but which may fairly be held to exist in the minds of the parties. We cannot think that there is any such understanding as to risks arising from the negligence of fellow-servants. The truth is that the exemption of the master in these cases is an exception to the general rule "*respondent superior*," which the judges, whether rightly or wrongly, have invented to meet the supposed justice or expediency of the case. We cannot think that in substance and in fact the law of contract has anything to do with the matter, and therefore we object to the form in which the doctrine initiated in the case of *Priestly v. Fowler* is frequently stated by the decisions. It seems to us that the true mode of expressing the law is to say that the relation of master and servant modifies the ordinary rule of the law of torts by which the law makes the master responsible for certain torts committed by the servant in the course of his employment quite apart from any agreement. If there is no real implied agreement by the parties that the master shall not be responsible, the only ground upon which the law can imply an agreement is that the justice and expediency of the case require an exception to the ordinary rule of *respondent superior*. If the justice of the case does require such an exception, nothing is gained by creating the fiction of an implied contract. It carries the matter no jot farther, and it is an obviously weak position to fall back upon the proposition that there is such a contract as an ultimate reason for the law.

It seems to us that the only satisfactory mode of dealing with the question is to consider, first, what is the reason of the law by which the master is in general made responsible for the wrongdoing of his servant in cases where such wrongdoing is not in fact authorized by him; and, secondly, to consider whether there is anything in the relation of master and servant to alter the position in which the master stands towards his servant in this respect from that in which he stands towards the general public. There is no possibility of satisfactorily dealing with the subject without going to the roots of the matter with regard to the reasons of the general rule to which the doctrine of *Priestly v. Fowler* is the exception. Mr. Joseph Brown, Q.C., states in his evidence that he objects to the general rule by which the master is made responsible for the torts of his servant which he has not authorized, and which indeed he may have expressly forbidden. It is perhaps not very profitable to discuss the justice or expediency of the law on this matter in the present connection, and no doubt it works very great hardship, but, on the whole, we think the law may be justified, partly from the justice of the case, and partly on consideration of the very great evils that would result if the law were otherwise. This question may be open to argument, but it is not the point to which we are now directing our attention. It would be very bad and unjust law to make or uphold an exception in favour of the master in the particular case of the servant on grounds that ought to exempt him altogether in all cases. Our object is to get at the grounds of justice or expediency upon which the original rule making the master responsible must be considered as founded, in order to see whether there is anything in the relation of master and servant which causes such grounds to be inapplicable to that case.

We have already stated, in our former observa-

tions on this subject, what we consider to be the substantial foundation of justice upon which the general rule rests. We do not say that the expression of the grounds of the rule in the decisions would always be included in the proposition we should lay down, but, in discussing the question of an alteration of an existing state of the law, we are entitled to look at the matter apart from mere authority. In our opinion the true justification for the existing rule is that the employment in the course of which the servant commits the tort is carried on for the benefit of the master, and if a man chooses to delegate the performance of acts done for his benefit, *quoad* the general public he is responsible for the mode in which the acts are done, so that, if a member of the general public is injured by the tort of the delegate in performing the act delegated, the master is responsible. There is more or less danger involved in many, if not most, of the common operations of life according as they are carefully or negligently performed. The operation, whatever it might be, would, in an elementary social state, be performed by the person who derived the benefit resulting from it, and the burthen of responsibility in respect of the risk involved to others would be borne by him. If, for money or other consideration, he gets some one to do it for him, he still takes the benefit, and ought to take the risk.

In general, the member of the public who suffers the tort is no party to the operation performed, but it is otherwise in the case of the servant. Mr. Macdonald, in his examination of Mr. Joseph Brown,* does not seem to us to proceed on sound politico-economical notions with regard to capital and labour. He ignores the fact that all mercantile enterprises are substantially carried on for the joint benefit of both employer and employed. He puts it as a reason for the master's responsibility to the servant that he derives all the profits. This seems to us, we must confess, fallacious. Wages are substantially a share of profits, only the amount of them is fixed instead of uncertain; and, more than this, the master must pay them whether a net profit to himself be earned or not, so that it is not too much to say the enterprise is carried on for a certain profit to the servant, but an uncertain and contingent one to the master. Now we say that under these circumstances the servant does stand in a different relation to the master from that in which the general public stand with regard to a tort committed by another servant in the course of the common employment. He knows that the delegation of different operations to different persons by the master is necessary and unavoidable in the conduct of the enterprise by which all are jointly to profit, and under these circumstances he who takes part of the benefit arising out of such delegation must take the risk also naturally arising out of it. It seems to us that it may very strongly be argued that these considerations altogether remove the case out of the scope of the reasons upon which the general rule is founded, and we confess that, as at present advised, we consider such an argument would be well founded.

It is admitted that there are limits to the application of the principle of the exception. The employment must be a common employment. If the coachman of a cotton spinner runs over one of his factory hands the exception will not apply. It is obvious that there is then no enterprise carried on for the benefit of both master and servant. It may, perhaps, be admitted that the doctrine of common employment has sometimes been carried too far in exempting the master. We know that this complaint is made against the decisions. We are not able, without referring to particular decisions, nor have we space, to deal with this, which is after all a question of detail. Again, it is urged that the master should be liable for the negligence of what is sometimes called a vice-master, such as a foreman, inspector of works, or such other head servant or officer. But at

* P. 41 of the Blue-book.

present, upon the principles we have laid down, we have a difficulty in seeing why any distinction should be made between such a person and any other fellow-servant. To us it seems that the original rule is a very strong one by which a person guilty of no real negligence whatever, and who may have used the utmost care in the selection of his servants, is made responsible for their negligence. The ground of his liability which we suggest is that, of two innocent persons, the one who caused the risk to be incurred for his own benefit must suffer, but, where the person injured shares the benefit and concurs in the causation of the risk, the only ground on which so hard a rule can be justified ceases.

The strongest argument in favour of the alteration of the law, and one which is brought out very strongly in the discussions that took place before the select committee, is that which is no doubt a very strong argument on grounds of expediency in favour of the general rule by which the master is made responsible to the public at large. It is obvious that if the master were not responsible for the tort of his servant, there would be very insufficient security for the public. The servant would be a man of straw not worth suing, and the master, not being responsible, would have no interest compelling him to look after his servant. But the master being responsible will, of course, not only be more likely to look after his servant, but also if the servant causes him to incur liability by his tort will dismiss him. There is, therefore, a constant check upon the servant in the interests of the general public. It is said that the absence of a similar state of things in respect of the master's liability to the servant diminishes the security of the servant. We must candidly admit we are afraid it does. But then is that admission sufficient to land the opponents of the present law in the conclusion they wish to arrive at? We doubt it. It seems to us that the matter of expediency we have alluded to, though a most excellent result of the general rule as to the liability of the master, would not alone, according to the principles of justice, have been a justification for its establishment. The mere fact that the rule would make the servant careful would not have justified the imposition of this very harsh responsibility on the innocent master without considerations of another character which we have endeavoured to explain.

On the whole, while we do not say that the question whether some modification of the existing law should take place is not an arguable one, and one well worthy of further consideration, at present we are not convinced that the existing law is unjust or that it requires alteration.

Mr Justice Grove and Mr. Justice Mellor have been appointed election judges for the ensuing year.

The Chief Judge in Bankruptcy will sit on Monday next, and every succeeding Monday during the sittings, to hear appeals, of which twenty-three have been entered.

The transfer by warrants under her Majesty's Sign Manual to the Court of Appeal, under the provisions of the 15th section of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, of Sir George William Wilshire Bramwell, Knight, Sir William Balliol Brett, Knight, and Sir Richard Paul Amphlett, Knight, is gazetted.

On Monday, at Worship-street Police-court, a man who appeared to answer the complaint of Mr. Holloway, inspector under the Reformatory Schools Act, that his contribution towards the support of his child in a reformatory was unpaid, said, admitting that the money was due, that he could not afford to pay it.—Mr. Hannay asked if he had any goods on which to distrain.—The man replied that he had a wife and four children.—Mr. Hannay observed that, according to Shakespeare, a man's wife and children were his chattels, but that the law would not care to take them in execution.—The man said the law was quite welcome to do so.

Cases of the Week.

BUSINESS IN THE COURT OF APPEAL.—On the 2nd inst. the Lord Chancellor (sitting in the Court of Appeal at Westminster with Lord Justice James, Sir R. Baggallay, and Sir G. W. Bramwell) announced that, during the present sittings, the Court of Appeal will sit in two divisions, one in Lincoln's-inn and the other at Westminster. The division sitting in Lincoln's-inn will hear the appeals from the Chancery Division, and from the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division of the High Court. The division sitting at Westminster will hear the appeals from the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions of the High Court. This arrangement is made with the view of, as far as possible, equalizing the amount of business allotted to the two divisions of the Court of Appeal.

SECURITY FOR COSTS.—PLAINTIFF OUT OF JURISDICTION.—ORD. 55, r. 2 (R. 7 OF FEBRUARY, 1876).—In a case of *Paxton v. Bell*, heard by the Court of Appeal on the 2nd inst., a question arose as to the amount of security for costs to be given by the plaintiff out of the jurisdiction. The defendants asked that the plaintiff should deposit £1,000. The chief clerk thought that £300 would be a reasonable sum. Bacon, V.C. (24 W. R. 1013), thought that the old rule of the Court of Chancery, which required security to be given to the amount of £100, ought to prevail, unless some special ground was shown for requiring security for a larger amount, and he ordered £100 to be deposited in court, together with a sum sufficient to cover the costs of payment in and out of court. The Court of Appeal (Lord Cairns, C., James, L.J., and Baggallay and Bramwell, J.J.A.) declined to interfere with the exercise of the Vice-Chancellor's discretion, being of opinion that he had not intended to lay down any general rule. They observed that, if the amount ordered to be deposited by way of security should turn out to be insufficient, an application could be made to the Vice-Chancellor to increase it.

SERVICE AS ARTICLED CLERK.—On the 2nd inst., before the Master of the Rolls, in a case of *Ex parte Adams, C. H. Turner* made an application on behalf of an articulated clerk under the following circumstances:—On the 6th of September, 1870, Mr. H. E. Adams was articulated to his father for the statutory period of five years, and he served thereunder up to the 2nd of October, 1873. On that day, by an indenture of assignment, the applicant's services were assigned to T. M. Dalton for fifteen months; he accordingly served Mr. Dalton for that period, and then returned and completed his five years in his father's office. It was, however, decided by the Court of Queen's Bench (see 23 W. R. 595, L. R. 10 Q. B. 227) that such service was not continuous service under the articles, and did not entitle him to admission. Thereupon the applicant, with a view to complete his period of service, returned to his father and served him for the fifteen months next succeeding the end of the five years under a mere parol contract, and he now applied that this last period of fifteen months might be reckoned as part of his service under the articles. The Incorporated Law Society offered no opposition, but desired the opinion of the judge. Counsel having referred to *Ex parte Moses* (22 W. R. 57, L. R. 9 Q. B. 1) and other cases in support of his motion, the Master of the Rolls said:—There are two or three cases of illness, and that is a rational ground for making allowance, for a clerk can hardly be expected to give continuous service when ill; but if the man is ill too long the court has refused to allow the time to count. In one case, however, the court permitted an articulated clerk to serve the additional time necessary to make up his term. But in other cases supplemental articles have been deemed necessary. Here the subsequent service was under a contract by parol, and not a contract in writing as required by the statute. Such a contract cannot be extended or varied in this way. Under the special circumstances I will allow the applicant to go in for his examination, and will grant an order nisi for that purpose against the Incorporated Law Society, which will be sufficient, as they make no objection to the applicant; afterwards he can complete his period of service.

Obituary.

SIR JOHN STUART.

The Right Hon. Sir John Stuart, Knight, who was for many years a Vice-Chancellor, died on Sunday, the 29th ult., at the age of eighty-three. The deceased was the second son of Mr. Dugald Stuart, of Ballychulish, Argyleshire, and was born in 1793. He was educated at the High School and the University of Edinburgh, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1819. He became an equity draftsman and conveyancer, and was for several years a reporter, being one of the compilers of Simon and Stuart's Reports in the Court of Vice-Chancellor Leach. He received a silk gown from Lord Cottenham in 1839, and was soon successful in obtaining leading business. In January, 1846, he became a candidate for the borough of Newark in the protectionist interest (the seat having been vacated by Mr. Gladstone, who had been appointed as Colonial Secretary, and who declined to contest the borough again in consequence of his difference with the Duke of Newcastle on the question of free trade), and he was returned without opposition. He was re-elected (after a close contest) at the general election of 1847. He took an active part in the business of the House of Commons, opposing the free trade measures of Sir Robert Peel, and the general policy of the Government of Lord John Russell. At the general election of July, 1852, he relinquished his seat at Newark, and became a candidate for Bury St. Edmunds, where he was returned by a narrow majority. He did not, however, retain the seat for many weeks, for in the following September he was appointed by Lord St. Leonards to a Vice-Chancellorship, which had become vacant by the death of Sir James Parker, and he shortly afterwards received the honour of knighthood. Vice-Chancellor Stuart sat on the bench for upwards of eighteen years. He sat in court for the last time on the 25th of March, 1871, when Mr. Greene, Q.C., the senior practitioner in the court, made a most eulogistic farewell speech, which, as well as the Vice-Chancellor's reply, was loudly cheered. Sir J. Stuart was sworn in as a Privy Councillor on his retirement, but he seldom took part in the deliberations of the Judicial Committee. He was a man of most active habits, and an enthusiastic sportsman, and maintained all his mental and bodily powers till a short time before his death. The deceased was married to the daughter of Mr. Duncan Stewart, and leaves two sons and one daughter. His eldest son, Mr. Dugald Stuart, was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1845, and was for many years his father's private secretary.

LORD LISGAR.

The Right Hon. John Young, first Lord Lisgar, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., died at Lisgar House, Cavan, on the 6th inst., after an illness of several months, at the age of sixty-nine. The deceased peer was the son of Sir William Young, of Baillieborough Castle, Cavan (who was created a baronet in 1821), and was born in 1807. He was educated at Eton and at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, where he graduated second class in classics in 1829. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in 1834, but appears to have never been engaged in actual practice. The deceased entered the House of Commons in 1831 as M.P. for the County of Cavan in the Conservative interest. He was appointed a Lord of the Treasury by Sir Robert Peel in 1841, and held that office till 1844, when he became Financial Secretary to the Treasury, a post which he retained till the retirement of the Government in 1846. He was Chief Secretary for Ireland (in the Earl of Aberdeen's Ministry) from 1852 to 1855, when he was appointed Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands. He returned to England in 1859, and he was Governor of New South Wales from 1860 till 1867, and Governor General of Canada from 1868 till 1872. He succeeded his father in the baronetcy in 1848, he was sworn in as a Privy Councillor in 1852, and he was raised to the peerage by Mr. Gladstone in 1870 as Baron Lisgar of Lisgar and Baillieborough. Lord Lisgar was a Civil Knight Grand Cross of the Bath, a Knight Grand Cross of the Order of St. Michael and St. George, and Lord Lieutenant of the county of Cavan. He leaves no family, and the peerage is thus extinct, but the baronetcy passes to his nephew, Mr. William Need Muston Young.

MR. JOHN BRUNTON FALCONAR.

Mr. John Brunton Falconar, solicitor, died at Newcastle-upon-Tyne a few days ago. Mr. Falconar was the son of the late Mr. John Brunton Falconar, of Newcastle, and was admitted a solicitor in 1847. He was for several years associated with Mr. John Fenwick and Mr. John Clerevaux Fenwick, but after the death of Mr. Fenwick, sen., the partnership was dissolved. Mr. Falconar was a commissioner for oaths in the Supreme Court. He had been for several years clerk to the Howdon-upon-Tyne Local Board of Health. He had long taken an active part in corporation matters as a town councillor, and he served the office of Sheriff of Newcastle in 1873. The town council have unanimously passed a resolution expressive of their sorrow at Mr. Falconar's death.

MR. JOHN ROWSON LINGARD.

Mr. John Rowson Lingard, solicitor, of Manchester, died suddenly, from the effects of paralysis, on the 24th ult., in his sixty-fourth year. The deceased was born in 1812, and was admitted a solicitor in 1835. He carried on business at 4, Westminster-chambers, Victoria-street, in partnership with Mr. Richard Boughey Monk Lingard Monk, and also (in the firm of Lingards & Newby) at Manchester with the same gentleman with Messrs. Thomas Dewhurst Lingard and John Robert Newby. He had a large business, both in London and at Manchester. Mr. Lingard had been for many years a director of the Law Union Insurance Company, and he was also a director of the Metropolitan and St. John's-wood Railway Company. The half-yearly meeting of the latter body was held a few days after his death, when the chairman and Sir Edward Watkin each paid a tribute to his memory.

MR. EDWARD CLARK.

Mr. Edward Clark, solicitor and notary, late of Bristol, died at his residence at Weston-super-Mare, on the 10th inst., at the age of sixty-nine. Mr. Clark was born in 1807, and was admitted a solicitor in 1830. He soon afterwards went into partnership with the late Mr. Charles Savery, being afterwards joined by Mr. James Flower Fussell and Mr. Fokett Savery. After the death of Mr. C. Savery, Mr. Clark became the head of the firm, which was afterwards joined by Mr. Charles John Collins Prichard. Mr. Clark was a notary public, and carried on a very extensive private practice, his firm being solicitors to the Bristol and Exeter Railway Company and other important commercial bodies. He was highly respected in Bristol, and was personally popular with all classes in the city. Mr. Clark retired from practice about fourteen years ago, and had ever since resided at Weston-super-Mare. He enjoyed sound health till about three months ago, but since that time he had suffered from disease of the heart. Mr. Clark was buried on Saturday last at the Arncliffe Cemetery, Bedminster.

MR. WILLIAM GILLESPIE DICKSON.

Mr. William Gillespie Dickson, advocate, sheriff of Lanarkshire, died very suddenly at Westfield, Glasgow, on the 19th inst., in his fifty-fourth year. The deceased was born at Edinburgh in 1823, was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and was admitted a member of the Faculty of Advocates in 1847. He is well known as the author of a work on "Evidence," which has long been a principal textbook for the legal profession in Scotland. Mr. Dickson was Procurator and Advocate-General for the Island of Mauritius, and an *ex-officio* member of the Executive and Legislative Councils of the colony from 1856 to 1868, when he became sheriff substitute for Lanarkshire, and in January, 1874, he succeeded the late Mr. Henry Glassford Bell as sheriff principal. He discharged his judicial duties with great success, proving himself a sound lawyer, and an industrious and patient judge; and he was highly respected by all classes in Glasgow and Lanarkshire. Mr. Dickson had for some time suffered from neuralgia, and it is thought that his heart was diseased. He attended in his official capacity on the recent visit of the Prince of Wales to Glasgow.

MR. CHARLES RICE HARRIS.

Mr. Charles Rice Harris, solicitor, died at his residence, Sirhowy House, Tredegar, on the 13th inst., at the age of seventy-one, from an attack of bronchitis. Mr. Harris was born in 1805, and was admitted a solicitor in 1859, since which date he had practised at Tredegar. He was a commissioner to administer oaths in the Supreme Court, and he held several important appointments, being clerk to the Tredegar Board of Guardians and Assessment Committee, to the Bedwellty School Board, and to the Aberystwith Rural Sanitary Authority. Mr. Harris was buried at Bedwellty Church on Wednesday, the 18th inst. The Tredegar Assessment Committee have passed a vote of condolence with his family. It is stated that his son, Mr. C. H. R. Harris, who was admitted a solicitor in Easter Term last, will be elected clerk to the board of guardians.

General Correspondence.

AUCTIONEERING ON CO-OPERATIVE PRINCIPLES.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—We think the inclosed is somewhat unusual and deserving of notice. It reached us by this morning's post.

CARR, FELTON, & CARR.

7, Vigo-street, London, W., Oct. 28.

[The following is the circular referred to:—

— Estate Office,

Auctioneer, Surveyor, and Valuer

(On Co-operative Principles),

—, —, —, W.

Sir,—Co-operation ought to be beneficial to all professions, as well as to trades, and my object is to offer you an opportunity of reaping such benefits from your own profession by co-operating with myself, and to obtain which it is only necessary for you to recommend or employ me for any sales, valuations, or surveys you may require to be done; it being distinctly understood that you are to receive from one-third to one-half of all fees paid to me through your recommendation.

If you would but give six months' trial to this proposal, the results would soon convince you of the desirability of it being continued.

My experience is that, whenever sales or valuations have been made in the country by a London auctioneer, the result has generally been most satisfactory.

Any appointment you may be pleased to make will be duly kept by, Sir, yours most obediently,

— — —.]

UNLAWFUL MAINTENANCE.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—A paragraph in your issue of the 21st inst. on the above subject ventilates a question upon which I have long wished for some enlightenment, and I am induced to trouble you with these lines in the hope that one of your numerous readers will kindly inform me whether it is maintenance for an association to find the necessary funds for prosecuting suits by "aggrieved parishioners" who in no way belong to the body. Any information on this subject will greatly oblige.

London, Oct. 26.

C. A. M.

By a printer's error in column 2 on p. 968, in last week's issue, "Oxford" was on two occasions printed for "Orford."

C. D. Allmy, city attorney of Des Moines, Iowa, says the *Albany Law Journal*, appeared against a prisoner who had been guilty of another crime than that upon which he was held, but in order to procure a warrant it was necessary to send a long distance. Seeing that there was no case against the accused upon the charge made, he addressed the court for eight hours until a warrant could be procured upon the other charge, and the prisoner arrested thereupon.

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting (the first after the vacation) of this society, held at the Law Institution on Tuesday last, the question appointed for discussion was—"Bequest of a fund to trustees upon trust to transfer the same, with any accumulations, to the children of A. in equal shares on their attaining twenty-one, with directions for their maintenance out of the income thereof in the meantime. Has a child who dies before attaining twenty-one a vested interest in the fund?" (*In re Peek's Trust*, 21 W. R. 820; *Bolding v. Strugnell*, *Re Holt*, 24 W. R. 339; *Spencer v. Wilson*, 21 W. R. 838.) Mr. Betts opened the debate in the affirmative, and was followed by Mr. W. Hughes in the negative. After a very full discussion it was decided by the society in the negative by the casting vote of the chairman, Mr. Eady.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The usual weekly meeting of this society was held on Wednesday, the 25th of October, at Clement's-inn Hall, Mr. E. W. Dean, LL.B., in the chair. After the transaction of some formal business, Mr. E. C. Rawlings opened the subject for debate—viz., "That the state of business at the common law Judges' Chambers is a scandal to the profession, and that it is desirable that the same should be assimilated to the chancery chambers." The motion was carried by a majority of seven.

At the meeting held on Wednesday evening, November 1, after three new members had been elected, Mr. A. J. Parker opened the subject for the evening's debate—viz., "That the learned professions should be open to women." The motion was adjourned till the first Wednesday in December next.

Appointments, Etc.

Mr. HENRY HAWKINS, Q.C., who has been appointed a Judge of the High Court, is the son of Mr. John Hawkins, solicitor, of Hitchin. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Easter Term, 1843, and joined the Home Circuit and the Essex and Hertfordshire Sessions. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1858, and he has had a very extensive practice. The new judge unsuccessfully contested the borough of Barnstable in the Liberal interest in 1865. He is a bencher of the Middle Temple.

Mr. HENRY HORN ALMACK, of Long Melford, has been appointed a Magistrate for the County of Suffolk. Mr. Almack is the son of the late Mr. Richard Almack, solicitor. He was born in 1835, was educated at Harrow, and was admitted a solicitor in 1860. Mr. Almack practised for several years at Long Melford and at Clare in partnership with his father and Mr. Edward Freeland Fisher, but he has now retired.

Mr. JOHN DAW and Mr. RICHARD RENDLE MILLER DAW, solicitors, of Exeter, have been appointed Joint-Clerk to the new Governing Body of the Governors of the Trust as constituted under the provisions of the Endowed Schools Scheme for the Management of St. John's Hospital and other Charities at Exeter. They have also been appointed Joint-Clerk to the Governors of the Grammar School, of which the Bishop of Exeter is the chairman; and they have also been appointed Joint-Clerk to the Governors of Maynard's Girls' School, of which the Rev. E. Cook, Precentor of Exeter Cathedral, is the chairman.

Mr. JAMES FREDERICK MORRIS, solicitor, of Carmarthen, has been appointed Solicitor to the Second Carmarthen Building Society, in the place of the late Mr. William Richards.

Mr. CHARLES HUGH WATSON, solicitor, of Stourport, has been appointed Clerk to the Magistrates for the Hundred House Division of Worcestershire, in the place of Mr. William Henry Talbot, of Kidderminster, who has resigned. Mr. Watson is the son of the late Mr. Charles Whitehall Davies Watson, solicitor, many years clerk to the magistrates for the same division. He was admitted a solicitor in 1875, and is also clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes for the Hundred House Division.

Legal News.

Mr. Registrar Keene has given notice that he will hold his weekly sittings in liquidation matters every Thursday at half-past eleven o'clock instead of twelve as heretofore.

The *Bombay Gazette* states that the committee employed in framing the new Civil Procedure Bill contemplate introducing provisions for exempting Government and railway servants' salaries from attachment under civil process.

The large room at the Auction Mart was crowded yesterday at the sale, by Messrs. Edwin Fox & Bousfield, of shares in the New River Company. One-thirtieth of a King's original share was first submitted, and, after a spirited competition, realized £3,135, or at the rate of £94,050 for an entire share. The speciality of these shares is that they are a freehold property, and even a fractional part confers votes for the counties in which the company's estates are situated. Twenty-nine of the £100 new shares (£70 paid) were next offered, and were all sold, at £310 and £315 per share. These are the highest prices ever obtained, and a considerable increase on those obtained by the same firm at their sale in June last, when the King's shares realized at the rate of £88,000 per share, and the new shares, with £60 paid, fetched £285 to £295. At the early part of this century a King's share was sold for £7,000; and even at Messrs. Edwin Fox & Bousfield's sale of these shares in 1870 the price of a King's share was £42,360, which was at the time thought to be remarkably high.

Mr. Edward Preston, proprietor of Chambers' "Index of Next of Kin," writes to us:—"Some few weeks since you inserted a paragraph of mine as to the recovery of £200,000 from the Crown by reason of the legitimate next of kin of Mrs. Mangin Brown having turned up in reply to an advertisement issued by the Crown. This case has now been utterly eclipsed by the good fortune of a young Parisian who has recently been proved heir to a half share of no less a sum than 159,322,800fr. (or, in round numbers, \$6,400,000). The French papers state the facts shortly as follows:—"A young man named Martinengo, originally of Norach, lately a clerk in his uncle's office at Marseilles, has just inherited 80,000,000fr. under the most extraordinary circumstances. Several years ago a general of foreign origin died in Holland having no presumable heirs; his large fortune went to the Dutch Treasury. Nothing was heard of the general's family or his money for several years, when a short time ago the French Minister of Foreign Affairs and Prince Bismarck informed the Dutch Government that the inheritance was legally claimed by members of the general's family established in Marseilles and Germany. The Hague Cabinet made some difficulties at first, but was ultimately obliged to yield. The amount has now accumulated to the prodigious figure of 159,322,800fr., the whole to be divided between the two heirs. The Dutch Government have agreed to pay the amount in ten years by annual instalments of 16,000,000fr. I think it may safely be said that the above case is without precedent."

"A Solicitor" writes to the *Globe* with reference to Judges' Chambers:—"Nothing can be worse than the present system, and it would not be at all difficult to remedy it. At present all summonses (say 400 or 500 a day in each chambers) are issued for one hour on the next day, and are heard in the order in which you may be fortunate enough to fight your way in before the judge or master. The necessity of having a policeman to keep order is not unknown there. We never expect to get away from a summons under two hours, and it is very often three or four on two or three days. The remedies for the evils complained of would be:—1. To make the summonses returnable at different times, according to the nature of the application. 2. To let no summons be issued (except in cases of emergency) returnable at an interval of less than two clear days. 3. To have a list of the summonses made out and called over, and let the present absurd system of waiting the half-hour be abolished. 4. To let any summons be adjourned from the master to the judge on request, and to let all summonses go before a master in the first instance. These are the rules upon which the chancery Judges' Chambers are carried on, and they work as well as possible, considering the limited staff for the work to be done. The Commission on Legal Departments reported that they

thought the services of the masters in court at Westminster might be dispensed with. The clerks of the rules take notes of decided cases, and surely, therefore, the masters might be more usefully employed in Chancery-lane? Perhaps new rules will provide for this little grievance."

The London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* says that some difficulties having been experienced in connection with the registration of British trade-marks in Denmark, the Netherlands, and Sweden, a communication was recently addressed to Lord Derby inquiring whether legislation has taken place in any of those countries in reference to trade-marks since 1872, when a report upon this subject was issued, and as to the steps necessary to be taken for the protection of British trade-marks in those countries. Lord Derby at once opened communication with her Majesty's secretaries of legation in the respective countries, which has resulted in the following information:—No legislation has taken place since 1872 in Denmark, but protection is accorded to trade-marks by paragraph 273 of the Danish Criminal Law, which also punishes piracy thereof either by fine varying from 100 to 200 kroner (£5 to £10) or by a term of imprisonment. Proceedings are instituted in the ordinary courts of law at the instance of the aggrieved party. With respect to Sweden and Norway, owners of British trade-marks wishing to secure themselves against an infringement of their rights should cause a notice to be inserted in the official Government paper, both in Sweden and Norway, describing their trade-marks. This precaution will, it is stated, increase their chance of success in any suit they may be compelled to bring. Some legislation is contemplated with a view to afford greater protection to foreigners. There has been no legislation on this subject in the Netherlands since 1872, and the existing law does not appear to be effective. There is, however, reason to believe that the Netherlands Government intend to introduce a new law.

THE LATE MR. JUSTICE ARCHIBALD.

In the Common Pleas Division on Thursday, on the judges taking their seats, Lord Coleridge said:—"As this is the first occasion we have met since the vacation, I hope I am not doing too much in giving some notice to the great and irreparable loss which, not only this court, but the profession at large, both bench and bar alike, have sustained, in the removal from us, by swift and unexpected death, of my dear friend and most honoured and valued colleague Mr. Justice Archibald. I really believe there was no man who was more beloved by all who knew him, and I am sure there was no man who better deserved the affection he received. His great powers of mind, his learning, his judgment, tempered by gentleness which was never weakness, made him, indeed, at once a great judge and a most attractive man. I believe that a more stainless character than his was never borne by any man who sat upon the English bench. No one was fitter than he to be called from the great task of judging others to be judged himself. I have been told in words that I am glad to make my own, that every gentleman in the profession felt that in him they had lost a friend; and if he has left us in regret, he has left us also a beautiful example."

After a slight pause, Mr. Cohen, Q.C., the senior member of the bar present, rose and said:—"With your lordship's permission, I should like to say a very few words, representing as I do most unworthily the bar on the present occasion. I should like to assure your lordship that we heard with the most profound regret of the loss of Mr. Justice Archibald, whom myself and many of us on the Home Circuit knew well, and I think that I may say that I am certain no barrister was more respected or generally beloved. When one who was our friend took his seat on the bench, we were proud to find that the Home Circuit had the honour of furnishing the bench of England with, I think, one of the most impartial and one of the most courteous and eminent judges who ever adorned the bench. Undoubtedly, the bar of England felt, I may say without any pretence and with perfect sincerity, a very heavy blow when Mr. Justice Archibald was so prematurely cut off. I thank your lordship for reminding us that, at the same time that we regret his loss, we may all take him as a noble example of what may be done by a member of the bar who has always performed his duty in the noblest manner."

THE JUDICATURE ACTS AND THE LIVERPOOL PASSAGE COURT.

On Thursday, October 26, at the sitting of the Court of Passage, the assessor (Mr. T. H. Baylis, Q.C.) said, with reference to the Judicature Act in that court, he made no reply to the recommendation of the chairman of the Law Association, and it was better he did not make any reply, because when he came there he did not know what the cases would be. He had to make himself, therefore, from time to time, familiar by the records, as far as he could, with the subject-matters to be tried. He sometimes was considerably in the dark, because the pleadings did not give him that information which the new system did. He thought the new system would be a great advantage to that court, and he quite concurred in the recommendation which was made to him by the gentlemen forming the committee of the Law Association, and he need hardly say that at all times he should be glad to listen to, and be guided, if possible, by, the recommendations of that learned association, and also by the bar of that court and those who practised in it. He was sure the recommendations of that body would have in view as their object to execute justice and maintain truth. Having said this much, the only question was how and when that new system could be adopted. It would be inconsistent with the wish of the gentlemen practising in that court that they should have one system prevailing under the Judicature Act at the assizes, and another system prevailing in that court under the Common Law Procedure Acts. He had sat as commissioner trying cases for the judges at the last assizes at Manchester and Liverpool, and on those occasions when he read the records they gave light and information to him. They informed him of the nature of the issues which had to be tried, which was not always the case under the old system. But, as he had said, the question was when and how those recommendations could be carried out and the new system adopted by that court. At present he believed the system under the new Judicature Act had worked extremely well, but it was new, and there were many things that might be corrected and would be corrected in it. As difficulties occurred in the working out of that system the attention of the judges would be given as to the best mode of removing those difficulties, so as to make the whole system work satisfactorily. There would also be books published of the decisions given by the learned judges upon the working of the Judicature Act. He believed it would be well if some treatise were published—and he had no doubt they would have one about Christmas—to guide the officers of that court upon the system. He would take the assistance of those gentlemen to whom he had alluded as to the time when the new system might be brought into operation in that court. He should be glad of any communication from that learned society, or from the gentlemen practising in that court, with reference to the time or other matters which they thought might enable him to recommend to the Government the adoption of the new Act in that court.

SOLICITORS AND UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

SOME of the more eminent of the solicitors assembled at Oxford took the opportunity of giving a special turn to the discussions of the society by dwelling on the great advantages which solicitors would derive from being educated at Oxford or Cambridge, instead of plunging into business immediately after leaving school. A solicitor in a good position has demands made on him which he can scarcely fulfil adequately unless he has received a high and general education. He has to deal with large questions, important interests, and men in every rank of life. To do those who confide in him real good, he has often to grasp intricate problems with that broad and general hold which experience shows nothing but high education gives, except in the instance of men of the rarest natural powers. To counsel clients rightly, to bring before them his views, and to justify his actions, a solicitor starts with an incontestable advantage if he can make them feel from the outset that he has mastered a wide range of knowledge and has received the polish of literature. There is not the slightest fear that he will become too grand for his work, as his natural desire to make money will keep him within the bounds of modesty,

and he will be constantly sobered by the mass of routine work which he has to conduct or superintend. If, therefore, a solicitor aims at occupying a high position in his profession, he will lose, if he does not go to a university, benefits which no exertions in after-life can replace. Of all investments that a young man intending to be a solicitor can make, the best is to obtain a university education. It makes him a different man, and places him in a different position. And, as Mr. Lawrence pointed out in his exhaustive discussion of the subject, the universities now afford him all that for his special objects he can possibly require. As an Oxford man speaking to an Oxford audience, Mr. Lawrence dwelt chiefly on the course of study offered by Oxford to the young solicitor, although as much perhaps may be said for Cambridge. It is to be supposed that the aspirant has made some progress in the usual studies of good schools before he goes to college; and for a year he is encouraged at Oxford to go on with what he has learnt, and avoid the waste of discarding school studies at the precise moment when they are likely to produce some real fruit. He can then turn his attention to the theoretical study of law with every advantage and stimulus that professors of the highest class, college lectures, an excellent library, examination honours, and prizes in the way of scholarships and fellowships can bestow. All this is so true that few solicitors who wish to see their calling honoured would contest it.—*Saturday Review*.

WINTER ASSIZES.

ORDERS in Council have been issued under the Winter Assizes Act for the union of counties. We hope to print some of these orders next week; but in the meantime give a table showing their effect.

Counties to be united together to form one County, with the Name under which they are to be united.	Places at which the Winter Assizes are to be held
Northern and Salford Divisions (as defined by the Order in Council of the 4th day of May, 1864) of the county of Lancaster, county of Cumberland, county of Westmorland (Winter Assize County, No. 1).	Manchester.
County of York and county of the city of York (Winter Assize County, No. 2).	Leeds.
County of Lincoln, county of Nottingham, county of the town of Nottingham (Winter Assize County, No. 3).	Lincoln.
County of Derby, county of Leicester, county of the borough of Leicester, county of Rutland (Winter Assize County, No. 4).	Derby.
County of Warwick, county of Northampton, county of Bedford, county of Buckingham (Winter Assize County, No. 5).	Warwick.
County of Norfolk, county of Suffolk, county of Huntingdon, county of Cambridge (Winter Assize County, No. 6).	Norwich.
County of Oxford, county of Worcester, county of Hereford, county of Monmouth, county of Gloucester, county of the city of Gloucester (Winter Assize County, No. 7).	Worcester.
County of Salop, county of Stafford (Winter Assize County, No. 8).	Stafford.
County of Southampton, county of Wilts, county of Dorset (Winter Assize County, No. 9).	Winchester.
County of Devon, county of Cornwall, county of Somerset, county of the city of Bristol (Winter Assize County, No. 10).	Exeter.
County of Montgomery, county of Merioneth, county of Caernarvon, county of Anglesea, county of Denbigh, county of Flint, county of Chester (Winter Assize County, No. 11).	Chester.
County of Glamorgan, county of Carmarthen, county of the borough of Carmarthen, county of Pembroke, county of the town of Haverfordwest, county of Cardigan, county of Brecknock, county of Radnor (Winter Assize County, No. 12).	Swansea.

Courts.

WRECK COMMISSION COURT.*

WESTMINSTER.

(Before H. C. ROTHERY, Esq., Wreck Commissioner; and Admiral POWELL and Captain HARRIS, Assessors.)

Oct. 30, 31; Nov. 1.—*The Dinorah*.

Points of practice.

This was an inquiry directed by the Board of Trade, under the Merchant Shipping Acts, 1854—1876, into the circumstances attending the loss of the British barque *Dinorah*, by collision with the steamer *Dorunda*, in the Mediterranean on the night of July 27.

C. Bowen, appeared for the Board of Trade.

E. C. Clarkson, for the owners and officers of *The Dinorah*.

Butt, Q.C., for the owners and officers of *The Dorunda*.

Butt submitted that the necessary preliminaries had not been complied with, as the officers of *The Dorunda* had not received copies of the statements made to the Receiver of Wreck, and referred to *Bustros v. White* (24 W. R. 721, L. R. 1 Q. B. D. 423), but on

Bowen stating that they were taken for the purposes of the inquiry,

Butt admitted that they would be privileged, and withdrew his objection.

Clarkson applied to have the witnesses out of court.

Butt objected to the certificated officers for whom he appeared being excluded, as they might be made parties, and added that, if necessary, he should at once apply under r. 8 for leave to file an affidavit of interest, and thereupon have his clients made parties.

Clarkson argued that they were not parties, as no charge was made as yet, and at least that a time should be fixed within which an application should be made for leave to appear.

The COMMISSIONER held that under rr. 8 and 9 any person, by leave or otherwise, as the case might be, might be made a party, and that at present, no time being fixed for an application, he could and should allow Mr. Butt's clients to become parties, and they could not, therefore, be ordered out of court.

The COMMISSIONER stated that although no opening was provided for by the rules, he should wish the counsel for the Board of Trade to give a short outline of the case for the guidance of the court.

Bowen accordingly opened shortly, and then called the officers, &c., on board the ships, under r. 14.

On a question being put as to a witness's opinion of the cause of the accident,

The COMMISSIONER ruled that, as no charge was yet made against any one, such a question might be put.

The opinion of the commissioner being asked as to the order in which counsel should put questions to witnesses, he directed that the counsel for the Board of Trade should first examine, the counsel for the ship from which the witness came should next follow, then the counsel for the other ship, and that as the dispute between the respective owners, &c., was not before the court, and the court was sitting at the present stage for inquiry only, and not to try any charge, counsel might cross-examine those who would on a trial be their own witnesses; that the counsel for the ship from which the witness came might then re-examine, and the counsel for the Board of Trade re-examine in conclusion. He also held that r. 14 did not impose any obligation on the Board of Trade to call witnesses in the order named in the rule.

During the examination of one of the officers of *The Dorunda*,

Bowen called for the log of that vessel.

Butt declined to produce it unless ordered, and submitted that there was no right of discovery given in the rules.

The COMMISSIONER held that under section 31 of the Act of 1876 he had the powers given to an inspector under section 15 of the Act of 1854, and, therefore, that he could order the log to be produced.

On the third officer of *The Dorunda* being asked by Bowen, by way of cross-examination, as to his statements made to the Receiver of Wreck,

Butt objected, on the ground that this was not like a coroner's court, one held for the purposes of inquiry only, but that here the evidence might be used to substantiate a charge against the witness; and therefore it was opposed to all the principles of law to allow the Board of Trade to cross-examine their witnesses.

The COMMISSIONER stated that the objection was a very important one, and one that had been foreseen; but that although in a strictly criminal proceeding it might be very doubtful how far such questions could be put when a charge might be based upon the answer, and the grave question might be raised as to whether the English or foreign mode of dealing with criminal charges was preferable, yet at this stage of the present proceedings, when the counsel for the Board of Trade appeared rather for the general public than for any party, he ought to be allowed to ask anything material to the inquiry.

At the close of the evidence,

Bowen put in a written charge, as required by r. 15, against the second officer of the *Dorunda*.

Butt applied for a copy of the charge.

The COMMISSIONER said that although the 16th rule, which provided for a copy of the charge being given to the person charged, with a view to make him a party, and in the present case the person charged was already a party, yet it would be right that in all cases a copy of the charge should be given to the person charged.

The COMMISSIONER then, on the request of Butt, agreed to adjourn the case for the preparation of the defence.

Clarkson applied to be heard at some stage of the case, as his clients, though not charged, were interested in the general report of the court, if such was still to be made.

The COMMISSIONER stated that it would still be the duty of the court to report to the Board of Trade upon the whole case, and not merely as to the charge made; and that, under r. 20, all parties appearing would be entitled to be heard; that the proceeding was one throughout, and that the court still sat for the purposes of the whole inquiry and not merely to try the charge formulated in the midst of the proceedings under r. 15.

Nov. 3.—Clarkson and Butt having addressed the court for their respective clients.

The COMMISSIONER, in delivering judgment, adverted to some of the more important questions which had arisen during the case, adhering to his former opinion upon them.

The court returned the certificate of the second officer of *The Dorunda* with a reprimand.

No order was made as to costs.

The Solicitor to the Board of Trade.

Solicitor for *The Dinorah*, T. Cooper.

Solicitors for *The Dorunda*, Lyne & Holman.

COUNTY COURTS.

CROYDON.

(Before H. J. STONOR, Esq., Judge.)

In re James Elliott.

Bankruptcy Act, 1869, s. 80, sub-section 5.—Proposed transfer to the London court on the ground that the petitioning creditor was a client of the registrar.

Heathfield, applied, on the affidavit of Messrs. Berry and Prestcott, two creditors for about £10 each, that the proceedings in this case should be removed to the London Bankruptcy Court, on the ground that the petitioning creditor, Mr. Chasmore, a creditor for £800, was a client of the learned registrar of the court. He made the application without casting the slightest imputation upon the learned registrar.

His HONOUR intimated that he had no power to make the order prayed for, but only to make a declaration that it would be advisable to transfer the proceedings, as to which the creditors could afterwards exercise their own discretion under the 80th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869. He would, however, allow Mr. Heathfield to amend the motion and hear him upon it.

Heathfield then addressed the court, and at the conclusion of his argument,

His HONOUR, without calling upon Cooper Willis, who appeared as counsel for the petitioning creditor, refused the motion, and observed that for the purpose of conferring the benefit of immediate local justice on the parties concerned the Legislature had empowered the judges of county

* Reported by N. H. PATERSON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

courts having jurisdiction in bankruptcy to delegate their powers to the registrars of their courts. Those gentlemen were generally the most eminent solicitors in the locality, and consequently numbered among their clients the principal commercial men and tradesmen resident there or in the neighbourhood. If the judges delegated their powers to the registrars unreservedly, so that parties must abide by their decision unless they appealed to the Chief Judge and Lords Justices, it would be a serious question whether, in those cases in which the petitioning creditor or any other person interested was a private client of the registrar, the proceedings ought not to be removed to the London court, although such removal from distant places, as, for instance, Newcastle or Liverpool, would necessarily be attended with expense, inconvenience, and delay. In the courts, however, over which his honour presided he had never delegated his powers to the registrar unreservedly, for he had always made this reservation that all cases of difficulty and importance, and all cases in which the parties desired it, should be heard before him, and consequently he seldom attended a court without hearing numerous applications in bankruptcy. He was sure, however, that it would have been quite unnecessary for him to make this representation as regards cases like the present, for every registrar would spontaneously desire him to hear all litigated matters in which his clients were interested. The principle of English law and common justice, that a man is not to be a judge in his own case or in those cases in which he is interested for others, through being nearly related or professionally concerned, was so plain that the registrars would invariably, even without any application, reserve such matters for his honour's decision. There appeared, therefore, to be no ground for this motion, and it was accordingly dismissed; the costs of the petitioning creditor to be paid out of the first assets received.

Solicitor for the petitioning creditor, *J. S. Streeter*, Croydon.

New Orders, etc.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION ACT, 1876.

FORM OF APPEAL, METHOD OF PROCEDURE, AND STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE TO ALL APPEALS PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS ON AND AFTER THE 1ST DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1876.

To the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition and appeal of A.

Your petitioner humbly prays that the matter of the order (or orders, or judgment, or interlocutor) set forth in the schedule hereto* (or, so far as therein stated to be appealed against) may be reviewed before her Majesty the Queen in her Court of Parliament, and that the said order (or so far as aforesaid) may be reversed, varied, or altered, or that the petitioner may have such other relief (if specific relief be desired, it can be so stated in the prayer) in the premises as to her Majesty the Queen, in her Court of Parliament, may seem meet; and that (here name the respondents) may be required to lodge such printed cases as they may be advised, and the circumstances of the cause may require, in answer to this appeal; and that service of such order on the solicitors in the cause of the said respondents may be deemed good service.

To be signed by two counsel.

(Here insert schedule.)

FORM OF SCHEDULE.

"From her Majesty's Court of Appeal (England)."

"In a certain cause (or matter) wherein A. was plaintiff and B. was defendant.

"The order appealed from is in the words following, viz. (set forth order complained of), or, the order referred to in the above prayer is in the words following, the portion appealed from being printed in italics (set forth order, the portion complained of being printed in italics)."

We humbly conceive this to be a proper case to be heard before your lordships by way of appeal.

To be signed by two counsel.

* The schedule must set out the title of the parties to the cause or matter; and the decrees, orders, judgments, or interlocutors appealed against, and where the appeal is not against the whole decree, the part appealed against must be defined.

I, _____, clerk to Messrs. _____, of _____, solicitors for the appellants within named, hereby certify that on the _____ day of _____, I served Messrs. _____, solicitors for _____, the within-named respondents, with a correct copy of the foregoing appeal, and with a notice that on the _____ day of _____, or as soon after as conveniently may be, the petition of appeal would be presented to the House of Lords on behalf of the appellant.*

DIRECTIONS FOR AGENTS.

Method of Procedure.

In accordance with the foregoing notice, the appeal, printed on parchment (quarto size), in such form as will enable paper copies thereof to be hereafter bound up with the printed cases, is to be lodged in the Parliament office for presentation to the House, and (if the House be then sitting, or, if not, on the next ensuing meeting of the House) an order thereon for service on the respondents, or their solicitors, ordering the respondents to lodge cases in answer to the appeal, will be issued to the appellant's agent, such order, together with an affidavit of due service entered thereon, to be returned to the Parliament office within the period granted to the appellant for lodging his printed case, under Standing Order No. V.

Each appellant, where there are more than one, is required to enter into the recognizance. The appellants are required to submit to the Clerk of the Parliaments within one week after the date of the presentation of the appeal (unless the sum of two hundred pounds, as required by the Standing Order, be paid to the Receiver of Fees to the Parliament office for payment into the fee fund of the House of Lords†) the names of the sureties who propose entering into the bond; and, in the event of a substitute being proposed to enter into the recognizance in lieu of the appellants, the name of such substitute. Two clear days' previous notice of the names so proposed (for bond and recognizance) is to be given to the solicitor or agent of the respondents, and at the time of submitting the said names to the Clerk of the Parliaments a certificate from the solicitor or agent of the appellants is to be lodged in the Parliament office, certifying his belief in the sufficiency of the sureties and substitutes so proposed. At the termination of one week from the lodgment of such certificate, the bond and recognizance are to be issued to the solicitor or agent of the appellants for execution before a commissioner appointed to administer oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature in England, or a commissioner appointed to administer oaths in chancery in Ireland, or before a justice of the peace in Scotland. The bond and the recognizance (whether entered into by the appellants or by a substitute) to be returned to the Parliament office within one week from the date of the issue thereof to the solicitor or agent of the appellants.

The solicitors of those respondents who purpose lodging printed cases in answer to the appeal should attend at the Parliament office for the purpose of ascertaining the due execution of the recognizance and bond, and entering their names in the appearance book. (Notice of the meeting of the appeal committee is only sent to the solicitors of respondents who have thus signified their appearance in the cause.)

In English appeals six weeks' time, and in Irish and Scotch appeals eight weeks time, from the date of the presentation of the appeal, is granted to all parties to lodge printed cases and the appendices thereto.‡

In appeals in which the parties are able to agree in their statement of the subject-matter, it is optional to lodge a joint case with reasons *pro* and *con*, following the practice heretofore in use in common law appeals on a special case.

It is obligatory on the appellant, within the respective periods so limited as above, to lodge his printed cases, or the joint case before mentioned, and a printed appendix consisting of such documents, or parts thereof, used in

* Not less than two clear days' notice to be given of the intention to present an appeal.

† All drafts and cheques to be made payable to "House of Lords Fee Fund," and to be crossed, "Bank of England, Western Branch."

‡ Petitions for extension of time, lodged during the recess, do not prevent the dismissal of an appeal. (For form of Petition see appendix C.)

evidence in the court below, as may be necessary for reference on the argument of the appeal.

It is the duty of the appellant, with as little delay as possible after the presentation of the appeal, to furnish to the respondent a list of the proposed documents, and in due course a proof copy of the appendix. The proof is to be examined with the original documents by the respective solicitors of the parties. (Ten copies of the appendix, as soon as printed, to be delivered to the solicitor of the respondent.) The respondent is allowed to print any additional documents used in evidence in the court below, which may be necessary for the support of his case on the argument of the appeal, such documents to be paged consecutively with the appendix. (The proof to be examined, as aforesaid, by the respective solicitors, and prints delivered to the solicitor of the appellant.)

The costs incurred in printing the appendix will, in the first instance, be borne by the appellant, and the cost of the additional documents by the respondent, but these costs will ultimately be subject to the decision of the House with regard to the costs of the appeal.

The case and appendix must be printed quarto size, with seven or eight letters in the margin for facilitating reference, and should be submitted in proof to the clerks in the judicial office. Forty copies of the case and appendix are required to be lodged in the Parliament office; and subsequently, on the lodgment of the respondent's case, ten bound copies (see directions in the appendix hereto as to binding printed cases).

Where reference is made to a document printed in the appendix, the case must contain a marginal note of the page of the appendix containing such document.

There is no penalty on respondents who do not lodge their printed cases within the time limited by Standing Order No. V., but respondents can only appear at the bar on a printed case.

As soon as the printed cases of all parties and the appendix thereto have been lodged, it is optional for either side to set down the cause for hearing, but it is obligatory on the appellant, upon the lodgment of his printed cases and the appendix, to set down the cause for hearing within the time limited by Standing Order No. V. (*ex parte* as to those respondents who have not already lodged printed cases, upon proof, by affidavit, of the due service of the before-mentioned "order of service" upon the respondents or their solicitors). A respondent who has lodged his printed cases is at liberty to set down the cause for hearing on the first sitting day after the expiration of the time limited by the Standing Order for lodging printed cases.

The cause will then be ripe for hearing, and will take its position on the effective cause list.

STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE TO ALL APPEALS PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS ON OR AFTER THE 1ST DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1876.

STANDING ORDER I.

Time limited for presenting appeals. Ordered, that, except where otherwise provided by statute, no petition of appeal be received by this House unless the same be lodged in the Parliament office for presentation to the House within one year from the date of the last decree, order, judgment, or interlocutor appealed from.

Applicable to all decrees, &c., pronounced on and after the 1st day of November, 1876. In cases in which the person entitled to appeal be within the age of one and twenty years, or covert, *non compos mentis*, imprisoned, or out of Great Britain and Ireland, such person may be at liberty to present his appeal to the House, provided that the same be lodged in the Parliament office within one year next after full age, discovery, coming of sound mind, enlargement out of prison, or coming into Great Britain or Ireland. But in no case shall any person or persons be allowed a longer time, on account of mere absence, to present an appeal, than five years from the date of the last decree, order, judgment, or interlocutor appealed against.

STANDING ORDER II.

Appeals to be signed and certified by counsel. Ordered, that all petitions of appeal be signed, and the reasonableness thereof certified, by two counsel who shall have attended as counsel in the court below, or shall purpose attending as counsel at the hearing in this House.

STANDING ORDER III.

"Order of service." Ordered, that the "order of service" issued upon the presentation of an appeal for service on the respondent or his solicitor, be returned to the Parliament office, together with an affidavit of due service entered thereon, within the time limited for the appellant to lodge his printed cases, unless within that period all the respondents shall have lodged their printed cases; in default, the appeal to stand dismissed.

STANDING ORDER IV.

Recognizance. Ordered, in all appeals that the appellant or appellants do give security to the Clerk of the Parliaments by recognizance to be entered into, in person or by substitute, to the Queen of the penalty of five hundred pounds, conditioned to pay to the respondent or respondents all such costs as may be ordered to be paid by the House in the matter of the appeal; and further, that the appellant or appellants do procure two sufficient sureties, to the satisfaction of the Clerk of the Parliaments, to enter into a joint and several bond to the amount of two hundred pounds, or do pay in to the account of the fee fund of the House of Lords the sum of two hundred pounds; such bond, or such sum of two hundred pounds, to be subject to the order of the House with regard to the costs of the appeal: Ordered, that within one week after the presentation of the appeal the appellant or appellants do pay in to the account of the fee fund of the House of Lords the said sum of two hundred pounds, or submit to the Clerk of the Parliaments the names of the sureties proposed to enter into the said bond; and, in the event of a substitute being proposed to enter into the said recognizance, the name of such substitute; two clear days' previous notice of the names so proposed for bond and recognizance to be given to the solicitor or agent of the respondent: Ordered, that the said bond and the recognizance (whether entered into by the appellants or by a substitute) be returned to the Parliament office duly executed within one week from the date of the issue thereof to the solicitor or agent of the appellant or appellants. On default by the appellant or appellants in complying with the above conditions, the appeal to stand dismissed.

STANDING ORDER V.

1. *Printed cases, time limited for lodging, and for setting down the cause for hearing.* Ordered, that in English appeals the printed cases and the appendix thereto be lodged in the Parliament office within six weeks from the date of the presentation of the appeal to the House; in Scotch and Irish appeals, within eight weeks; and the appeal set down for hearing on the first sitting day after the expiration of those respective periods (or as soon before, at the option of either party, as all the printed cases and the appendix shall have been lodged); on default by the appellant the appeal to stand dismissed.

2. *Scotch appeals.* Ordered, that in all appeals from Scotland the appellant alone, in his printed case or in the appendix thereto, shall lay before this House a printed copy of the record as authenticated by the Lord Ordinary; together with a supplement containing an account, without argument or statement of other facts, of the further steps which have been taken in the cause since the record was completed, and containing also copies of the interlocutors or parts of interlocutors complained of; and each party shall in their cases lay before the House a copy of the case presented by them respectively to the Court of Session, if any such case was presented there, with a short summary of any additional reasons upon which he means to insist; and if there shall have been no case presented to the Court of Session, then each party shall set forth in his case the reasons upon which he founds his argument, as shortly and succinctly as possible.

3. *Printed cases to be signed by counsel.* Ordered, that all printed cases be signed by one or more counsel, who shall have attended as counsel in the court below, or shall purpose attending as counsel at the hearing in this House.

STANDING ORDER VI.

Cross-appeals. Ordered, that all cross-appeals be presented to the House within the period allowed by Standing Order No. V. for lodging cases in the original appeal.

STANDING ORDER VII.

Expiry of time during recess. Ordered, with regard to

appeals in which the periods severally dating from the presentation of the appeal under Standing Orders Nos. III., IV., V., and VI. expire during the recess of the House, that such periods be extended to the third sitting day of the next ensuing meeting of the House.

STANDING ORDER VIII.

Supplemental cases to be delivered in cases where appeals are revived or parties added.] Ordered, that where any party or parties to an appeal shall die pending the same, subsequently to the printed cases having been lodged, and the appeal shall be revived against his or her representative or representatives as the person or persons standing in the place of the person or persons so dying as aforesaid, a supplemental case shall be lodged by the party or parties so reviving the same respectively, stating the order or orders respectively made by the House in such case.

The like rule shall be observed by the appellant and respondent respectively, where any person or persons, party or parties in the court below, have been omitted to be made a party or parties in the appeal before this House, and shall, by leave of the House, upon petition or otherwise, be added as a party or parties to the said appeal after the printed cases in such appeal shall have been lodged.

STANDING ORDER IX.

Scottish Appeals.—Certificate of leave or difference of opinion to be signed by counsel on appeals.] Ordered, that when any petition of appeal shall be presented to this House from any interlocutory judgment of either division of the Lords of Session in Scotland, and counsel who shall sign the said petition, or two of the counsel for the party or parties in the court below, shall sign a certificate or declaration, stating either that leave was given by that division of the judges pronouncing such interlocutory judgment to the appellant or appellants to present such petition of appeal, or that there was a difference of opinion amongst the judges of the said division pronouncing such interlocutory judgment.

STANDING ORDER X.

Taxation of costs.] Ordered, that in all cases in which this House shall make any order for payment of costs by any party or parties in any cause without specifying the amount, the Clerk of the Parliaments or clerk assistant shall, upon the application of either party, appoint such person as he shall think fit to tax such costs, and the person so appointed may tax and ascertain the amount thereof, and shall report the same to the Clerk of the Parliaments or clerk assistant: And it is further ordered, that the same fees shall be demanded from and paid by the party applying for such taxation for and in respect thereof as are now or shall be fixed by any resolution of this House concerning such fees; and the said person so appointed to tax such costs may, if he thinks fit, either add or deduct the whole or a part of such fees at the foot of his report: And the Clerk of the Parliaments or clerk assistant may give a certificate of such costs, expressing the amount so reported to him as aforesaid; and the amount in money certified by him in such certificate shall be the sum to be demanded and paid under or by virtue of such order as aforesaid for payment of costs.

APPENDIX A.

(Certificate of Sufficiency of Sureties, &c.)

Lodged in the Parliament office on the _____ day of _____ 18____.

In the House of Lords

"A. and others v. B. and others."

In compliance with Standing Order No. IV., I (we) submit the names of (full name) of (address) and (full name) of (address) {as fit and proper sureties or,} to enter into the {bond} {thereby required: and I (we) certify in {my} {belief, that the said (full name) and the said (full name) {are each} {worth upwards of (£200)} {is} {£2500}} over and above {their} {just debts.

This certificate may be signed by the country solicitor or agent of the appellants.

I (we) certify that a copy of the above certificate and two clear days' notice of the intention to lodge the same in the Parliament office has been served on the solicitors or agents of the respondents.

To be signed by the London solicitor or agent of the appellants.

APPENDIX B.

(Directions for Binding Printed Cases for the use of the Law Lords.)

1. Ten copies bound in purple cloth; two of the ten to be interleaved, as regards the cases only.
2. Short title of cause on the back.
3. Label on side, stating short title of cause and contents of the volume, thus:—

"A—— and others v. B—— and others."

Printed copy of the appeal.

Appellants' case.

Respondent B's case.

Respondent C's case.

Appendix.

4. The volume to be indented, and the names of the parties written on the indentations to their respective cases.

5. References to the reports of the cause in the courts below, or the words "Not reported," to be written on the fly sheet.

6. The bound copies to be lodged immediately after the respondent's cases are delivered in.

The agents are requested to use their discretion as to the size of the volume, arrangement of the cases, and appendix. In dealing with bulky cases, it may be found advisable to bind the appendix as a separate volume, and also to divide the appellants' and respondents' cases into separate volumes.

It is the duty of the appellants' agent to carry out these directions.

APPENDIX C.

(Petition for Extension of Time to Lodge Cases, &c.)

(To be engrossed on foolscap paper, and (unless assent of respondent's agent be obtained) a copy, and two clear days' notice of intention to present, to be given to respondent's agent.)

In the House of Lords. (Insert short title of cause.)

To the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled.

The humble petition of the appellant

Sheweth, That the petitioner presented petition of appeal on the _____ day of _____ complaining of (insert dates of orders or interlocutors complained of).

That the time allowed by Standing Order No. V. ((or) extended by your lordships' order of the (state date)) for the appellant to lodge his printed cases and the appendix, will expire on the (state date).

That your petitioner (set forth cause of delay).

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays that your lordships will be pleased to grant him (set forth time required) further time to lodge his printed cases, and the appendix, and set down the cause for hearing. And your petitioner will ever pray.

Agents for the appellant.

, Agents for the respondent.

Court Papers.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

COURT OF APPEAL.

LIST OF APPEALS FOR NOVEMBER, 1876.

APPEALS FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION.

1876.

In re The Anglo-German Tunneling Co, limd app of Co M R.—May 3 pt hd (S.O.)
 Armitage v Gregson app of defts. V C B.—May 17 pt hd
 Ashley v Ashley Ashley v Ashley Ashley v Ashley Apps of T J Pitfield, L M Dyer, H C Butler, and Lord Abingdon, from V C Malins pt hd—April 3 ordered to stand over till November
 Murdoch v Mathew appl of dft G B B Mathew M R.—May 12
 Mason v Stewart app of dft G C Stewart from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster (Liverpool District) May 17

The Nene Valley Drainage and Navigation Improvement Commissioners (2nd District) v Dunkley app of defts M R.—May 18

Quilter v Berridge app of deft V C M.—May 20
The Phosphate Sewage Co, limd v Hartmont app of deft E. H. Hartmont V C M.—May 22

The Phosphate Sewage Co, limd, v Hartmont app of deft F. W. Englebach V C M.—May 30

The Phosphate Sewage Co, limd v Hartmont app of deft Jas Alex Molleson V C M.—June 28

Hervey Bathurst v Stanley, Craven v Stanley app of deft Sir John Errington, Bart M R.—May 25

Salomon v Sopwith app of defts V C M.—May 27
In re The National Funds Assurance Co, limd app of Co V C B.—June 1

Bigaby v Dickinson app of plt V C B.—June 2
In re The Bradford Tramways Co app of Lords Commissioners of H. M. Treasury V C M.—June 2

Eaglesfield v Marquis of Londonderry app of defts The Cambrian Rys Co and anr M R.—June 7

Eaglesfield v Marquis of Londonderry app of defts The Marquis of Londonderry and ors M R.—June 7

Master v Hansard app of defts The Crystal Palace Co V C B.—June 8

In re Heaton's Steel and Iron Co, limd (Blyth's case) app of Henry Blyth V C H.—June 8

Louthwaite v Louthwaite app of deft IP Birtwhistle V C H.—June 20

Goody v Pearson app of plt V C M.—June 21

Owens v Emmens app of plt V C B.—June 21

Lane v Flowers app of S Beyfus V C M.—June 22

Heaton v Holliday app of plt V C H.—June 25

In re Dalgleish's Settlement app of A C Dalgleish M R.—June 27

Hickman v Upsall app of deft Caroline M Samson V C H.—July 1

Godsell v Bischoffsheim app of deft H L Bischoffsheim V C M.—July 3

In re The Universal Non-Tariff Fire Insurance Co, limd app of F C G Riteo V C M.—July 8

The Ashton Vale Iron Co, limd, v Abbot app of deft Edward Knight V C M.—July 10

The Ashton Vale Iron Co, limd, v Abbot app of defts H N Abbot and ors V C M.—July 10

In re Poppel & Barratt's Contract, V & P Act, 1874 app of Thomas Barratt V C H.—July 10

West v Orr app of plt V C B.—July 12

Greenep v Hunt app of deft M R.—July 12

New Westminster Brewery Co, limd, v Hannah app of pits V C H.—July 12

In re Baillie's Trusts app of petrns V C M.—July 14

Brown v Jones app of deft V C B.—July 18

Tolson v Sheard app of plt V C H.—July 20

In re Bagshaw's Trust app of Richard Cartledge and anr V C H.—July 22

James v The Queen app of Attorney-Gen V C M.—July 22

In re The Great Australian Gold Mining Co, limd app of the Company V C H.—July 24

Concha v Murrieta app of Adelina Concha and anr V C B.—July 25

Jackson v Bellman app of pits V C H.—July 28

Hubbard v West app of deft V C B.—July 31

Cummins v Herron app of deft V C H.—Aug 1

Attenborough v Shirlaw app of deft V C H.—Aug 2

North British and Mercantile Insurance Co v Liverpool, London, and Globe Insurance Co app of defts (except Royal Insurance Co) M R.—Aug 12

In re Laffitte's Trusts, 10 & 11 Vict c 96 app of petrns F L Ducloux V C H.—Aug 23

In re Laffitte's Trusts, 10 & 11 Vict c 96 app of L F O L Cordier and anr V C H.—Aug 24

In re Curwen's Trusts, 10 & 11 Vict c 96 app of John Gambles V C H.—Aug 23

Vale v Oppert app of deft E H Hartmont V C B.—Aug 30

Vale v Oppert app of deft William Lonsdale V C B.—Sept 18

Webber v Wright app of deft Susannah Ives and ors V C H.—Sept 9

Walker v The Cheshire Lines Committee app of defts from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster—Sept 12

The New Sombrero Phosphate Co, limd v Erlanger app of pits V C M.—Oct 9

Cottrell v Cottrell app of deft G E Cottrell V C H.—Oct 18

In re Wernpiestill Colliery Co ex parte Dunn app of David Dunn V C H.—Oct 29

From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions.

Lacey v Hill app of J F H Read M R.—July 25 pt hd

Walker v Cheshire Lines Committee app of defts from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster—July 29 pt hd

Paxton v Bell app of deft Jas Bell V C B.—July 28

Fownes Luttrell v Clarke app of D Jones and ors V C M.—July 28

Concha v Murrieta app of Adelina Concha and ors V C B.—Aug 1

Holste v Robertson app of deft M R.—Aug 2

In re The European Central Railway Co, limd app of Liquidators of Oriental Financial Co limd V C B.—Aug 4

In re Wedgwood Coal and Iron Co, limd app of Alex B Anderson V C M.—Aug 5

Trail v Jackson app of Wm Currey V C H.—Aug 10

Garling v Royds app of plt V C H.—Aug 23

Plumpton v Spiller app of defts M R.—Aug 25

Turner v Moy app of defts Thomas Moy and ors V C B.—Aug 29

In re Cunliffe, Leaf & Co, solrs app of Cunliffe & Co Baron H for V C H.—Oct 24

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

Rustomjee v Her Majesty the Queen app of suppliant (petition of right) from L C J and Justices Blackburn and Lush Feb 29

The Queen v Steel and ors app of prosecutors from Justices Blackburn, Mellor, and Lush On Crown side March 3

Kynoch v Wilson app of defts on Special Case from Justices Blackburn, Quain, and Field March 4

The Queen v Benjamin Collins app of deft from L C J and Justices Mellor and Field On Crown side March 8

Hudson v Tabor app of plt from L C Justice and Justices Mellor and Quain March 25

Kopitoff v Wilson and ors app of defts from Justices Blackburn, Quain, and Field April 21

Blackall v Malcolm app of defts on Bill of Exceptions Action tried before Mr. Justice Blackburn April 22

Black v Dofford and anr app of defts Ord nisi granted returnable before Court of Appeal May 3

Robson v The North-Eastern Ry Co app of defts from Justices Blackburn and Field May 11

The Bishop of Exeter v Hawkins app of defts from L C Justice and Justices Blackburn, Mellor, and Field May 11

Hopkins and anr v The Great Northern Ry Co app of defts on sp c from Justices Blackburn and Quain May 15

Robinson v The River Wear Commissioners app of plt from Justices Blackburn, Mellor, and Field May 16

Turner v Samson app of deft from Justices Blackburn, Lush, and Field May 17

Shand and ors v Bowes and anr app of pits from Justices Blackburn, Mellor, and Lush May 23

Bunn v Richardson and anr app of plt from L C Justice and Justices Mellor, Lush, and Quain May 31

Sugg v Silber app of deft Ord nisi granted returnable before Court of Appeal June 9

In re Arbitration between R D Shafto and Sir G Elliot appl of R D Shafto from interlocutory order of Justices Mellor and Quain June 13

Perry v Mayhew app of deft from Justices Blackburn and Lush June 16

Tully v Howling app of deft from L C Justice and Justices Mellor and Quain June 17

Randall v Newson app of plt from Justices Blackburn and Lush June 21

The Yorkshire Engine Co v Crawley app of plt from Justices Mellor and Quain June 21

In the Common Pleas at Lancaster Cann v Hunter app of deft from Justices Blackburn and Lush June 23

Godfrey v Watkins app of plt from judgt in Lord Mayor's Court June 26

Sharp v Dawes app of deft from Ord of Court on motn for judgt June 30

In re Arbitration between F Hutton & Co and Messrs Callender & Mather app of Messrs Callender & Co from L C Justice and Justices Mellor and Field July 1

Sugg v Silber app of pits from L C Justice and Justices Mellor and Field July 4

Swire v Redman app of deft from L C Justice and Justice Lush July 5

McKibbin v Cashin app of deft in person from L C Justice and Justice Archibald July 8

Boulton v The Cockermouth, & Co, Ry Co app of deft from L C Justice and Justices Mellor and Quain July 10

Metcalfe v The Britannia Iron Works Co, limd app of plt from ord of L C Justice and Justices Blackburn and Field on sp c July 10

Wilks v Guest app of deft from L C Justice and Justices Mellor and Quain July 29

Harris v The Great Western Ry Co app of plt from Justices Blackburn and Quain Aug 1

In re E D Lewis, gent, one, &c ex pte Andrew Monro app of E D Lewis from Lord Coleridge and Justice Quain Aug 3

The Queen v H Fletcher, Esq, one of H M J P for Cumberland app of Robert Birnie from Lord Coleridge and Justice Quain (on Crown side) Aug 4

Dennis v Lewis app of deft Ord nisi granted returnable before Court of App Aug 7

Sanguinetti v Pacific Steam Navigation Co app of plt from Justices Mellor and Quain Aug 21
 Ellis v Munson app of deft from interlocutory order of Lord Coleridge and Baron Pollock Aug 21
 Mills v Griffiths app of deft from Justices Quain and Field Aug 26
 Mills v Griffiths app of deft from Justices Quain and Field Aug 26
 Aspinall v The Queen app of plt from L C Justice and Justices Blackburn and Field (in error) Sept 27
 Lindsay v Cundy app of plt from Justices Blackburn, Mellor, and Lush Oct 18

FROM THE COMMON PLEAS DIVISION.

Mayor, &c, of London v London Joint Stock Bank app of deft from Lord Coleridge 8 O till issues of fact tried
 Chatterton v Cave app of plts from Lord Coleridge and Justices Brett, Grove, and Lindley May 1
 Marsh v Isaac app of deft from Lord Coleridge and Justices Brett and Lindley May 1
 Griffith and wife v Taylor app of deft from Lord Coleridge and Justices Brett and Archibald May 11
 Thatcher, by next friend v Taylor app of deft from Lord Coleridge and Justices Brett and Archibald May 11
 Simpson and anr v Chadwick app of deft from Lord Coleridge and Justices Brett and Archibald May 17
 Hawkins v Walronde app of defts from L C Justice and Justices Archibald and Lindley May 18
 Brantom v Griffiths and ors app of defts from Justices Brett and Archibald May 22
 Kenworthy v Sidebotham app of defts from Justices Brett, Denman, and Archibald in the matter of a plaint in the County Court of Ashton-under-Lyne May 22
 The Metropolitan Ry Co v Brogden and ors app of defts from Lord Coleridge and Justices Brett, Grove, and Lindley May 25
 Corrie v Mayo app of deft from Lord Coleridge and Justices Brett and Lindley May 29
 Stone v Mayor, &c., of Yeovil app of defts from Justices Brett and Archibald May 30
 Roarke v White Moss Coal Co, Limd app of plt from Lord Coleridge and Justices Archibald and Lindley May 30
 Dingham & Co v Alexander & Co and anr app of deft George Bannister, jun., against defts Alexander & Co from Justices Brett and Denman May 31
 Kemp v Isaacson app of plt from Justices Brett and Archibald June 12
 Bradbury v Pickstone app of plt from Justices Brett, Denman and Archibald June 13
 Fox v Wallis Robinson v Wallis app of deft from Justices Brett and Denman June 14
 Charles v Blackwell app of plts from Lord Coleridge and Justices Brett and Lindley June 17
 The Croydon Commercial Gas and Coke Co v Dickinson app of plts from Justices Brett, Grove, and Lindley June 22
 Jackson v The Metropolitan Ry Co app of defts from Lord Coleridge and Justices Brett and Grove June 28
 Seaman v Netherliff app of plt from Lord Coleridge and Justices Brett July 3
 Stock v Hooper's Telegraph Works limd app of plt from Justices Brett, Grove, and Lindley July 3
 Stock v Hooper's Telegraph Works limd app of defts from Justices Brett, Grove, and Lindley July 3
 In the Court of Passage, Liverpool, Maclean v Vaughan app of defts from Justices Brett, Denman, and Archibald July 5
 Brown v Merchant app of defts from Justices Brett, Grove, and Archibald July 6
 Purcell v Sowler app of defts from Justices Brett, Archibald, and Lindley July 7
 Allgood v Gibson app of deft from Justices Brett and Grove July 8
 Keith v Burrows app of defts from Justices Brett, Archibald, and Lindley July 10
 Walker v London and North-Western Ry Co app of defts from Justices Brett and Archibald July 11
 Burchell v Clark app of plt from Justices Brett and Archibald July 28
 French v Gerber app of plts from Justices Brett, Grove, and Lindley August 1
 Kemp v Isaacson app of deft from Justices Brett and Archibald Oct 18

FROM THE EXCHEQUER DIVISION.

Ross v North-Eastern Ry Co app of plts from L C Baron and Baron Cleasby May 31
 Watson v Hodgson app of deft from Barons Bramwell and Cleasby June 3
 Cross v L'Hollier app of plt from Barons Bramwell, Amphlett, and Huddleston June 3
 Forster v Stobbs app of deft from Barons Bramwell and Cleasby June 7
 Hyde v Warden app of plt from L C Baron and Baron Cleasby June 21

Fisher v Smith app of deft from L C Baron and Baron Cleasby June 21
 Greaves v Greenwood app of defts from Barons Bramwell and Amphlett June 27
 Seddon v Smith app of deft from Barons Bramwell and Amphlett July 3
 Burton v The Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Ry Co app of defts from Barons Bramwell and Cleasby July 3
 Pooler v Johnston app of plt from Barons Bramwell and Cleasby July 4
 Bland v Merchant app of defts from L C Baron and Baron Pollock July 6
 Copland v Heatly app of plt from Barons Bramwell and Cleasby July 6
 Lanwer v Heatly app of plt from Barons Bramwell and Cleasby July 6
 Shields v The Felling Coal, &c, Co limd app of plts from interlocutory order of L C Baron and Baron Pollock July 6
 Preston v Lamont app of defts from Barons Bramwell and Amphlett July 11
 Learmonth v Croll app of plt from refusal of new trial by L C Baron and Barons Cleasby and Amphlett July 24
 Bailey v Bagnall app of deft from L C Baron and Baron Pollock July 25
 Clark v Callow app of deft from refusal of new trial by Justices Hannen and Quain August 11
 Lloyd v Lewis app of plts from interlocutory order of Justice Field and Baron Huddleston Sept 23
 Boulton v The Queen app of plt from L C Baron and Barons Bramwell and Amphlett Oct 23

FROM THE PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION.

Ship Corinna 1875—O—No. 95.—Owners, Master, and Crew of the Mary Anne and ors v Owners of the Corinna and Freight app of defts from Sir R J Phillimore March 10 (to be heard with nautical assessors)
 Ship City of Cambridge 1875—M.—No. 15—Malcolmson and others v Owners of the City of Cambridge app of defts from Sir R J Phillimore April 22 (to be heard with nautical assessors)
 Ship Medina 1876—N.—No. 235 app of defts from Sir R J Phillimore May 13
 Ships John Wells & Loreley 1875—H.—26 and G—27.—Hough and ors v Goolle Steam Shipping Co, Goolle Steam Shipping Co v Hough and ors Consolidated actions app of Hough and ors from Sir R J Phillimore May 24 (to be heard with nautical assessors)
 Cargo ex Schiller—No. 7,353 and No. 7,354—1875—L.—No. 11 Legg and ors v Owners of the cargo ex Schiller Consolidated actions app of defts from Sir R J Phillimore May 31
 Le Seur v Le Seur app of plts from judgt in Divorce by Sir R J Phillimore June 9
 Ship Franconia, 1876.—B.—207.—Burrell and ors v Owners of the Franconia app of defts from Sir R J Phillimore June 19 (to be heard with nautical assessors)
 Ship Parana—No. 6,664 app of defts from Sir R J Phillimore July 3
 Wallis v Wallis app of respt from two ords in Divorce by the president July 7
 Gladstone v Gladstone app of respt from ord in Divorce by the president Aug 26

FROM THE LONDON COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

In re Benson	Ex parte Waterhouse
In re East	Ex parte Marriss
In re Tate	Ex parte Tate
In re Dimsdale	Ex parte Pooley
In re Austin	Ex parte Austin
In re Low	Ex parte Field
In re Ld C Innes Ker	Ex parte Ld Chas Innes Ker
In re Ford	Ex parte Strickland
In re Holderness	Ex parte Tomkins
In re Strachan	Ex parte Cooke
In re Strachan	Ex parte Lockwood
In re Barraud	Ex parte Leman
In re Henley	Ex parte Dixon
In re Austin	Ex parte Yalden
In re Davies	Ex parte Davies
In re Hobb	Ex parte Jay
In re Cooke	Ex parte Saffery
In re Maplebeck	Ex parte Butt
In re Smith	Ex parte Cape
In re Webb	Ex parte Walter
In re Ranking	Ex parte Cooper
In re Lee	Ex parte Andrews
In re Lee	Ex parte Andrews
In re Bayliss	Ex parte Bayliss
In re Coote	Ex parte Coote
In re Newman	Ex parte Brooks
In re Cannaot	Ex parte Cannaot

Moffat v St James's Bank
 limd, Dear v Moffat cons
 acts trial with wits
 Dance v Dabbs act trial
 Murrell v Sandon c trial
 Edwards v Great Eastern Ry
 Co act trial
 Longdon v Bolton m d
 Boyes v Cook c trial
 Ritson v Zanetti c trial
 Wilks v Dickinson f c
 Roughton v Gibson c trial
 Meredith v Meredith c trial
 Bleas v Warrington, &c, Co
 f c and sums to vary
 Maretzek v Luoca c
 Lees v Lees act trial
 Richardson v Brammall act
 trial
 Gomonde v Pitt c trial
 Moxon v Price c trial
 Williams v Williams c trial
 Duffield v Woodward c trial
 Maerchant v Colson c trial
 Davies v Sykes c trial
 Boosey v Fairlie c trial
 Tout v Tout f c
 Edwards v Jenkins c trial
 Hensley v Somerset &c Ry
 Co c trial
 Vickers v Vickers act trial
 Mott v Turner act trial
 Scott v Wood act trial
 Pearse v Pearse f c & sums to
 vary
 Mills v Marlon f c
 Hunter v Clark c trial
 Barnes v Wilts Canal Naviga-
 tion c trial
 Harrison v Sharp motn judgt
 Rose v Rose c trial
 Constable v Dendy c trial
 Farrell v Wale c trial
 Back v Hay c trial
 Morris v Lloyd f c
 Toms v Toms f c
 Frewen v Hamilton c trial
 Stowe v Neale act trial and m
 judgt

DIVISIONAL COURT OF APPEAL.

Hill v Perse appl of deft from Westminster County
 Court Feb 5
 In re James Mes appl of James Mee from Leicester County
 Court May 2
 Powis v Lord Dynevor appl of deft from Glamorganshire County
 Court July 17
 Ley v Collis appl of plt from Glamorganshire County Court
 Aug 1

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir JAMES BACON.

Causes

Set down previous to transfer.

Henderson v Grange c with wits
 Barrett v Vernon m d with
 wits
 Clark v Bullows m d
 Bottle v Knockner m d (V C
 M)
 Roe v Davies m d with wits
 Attorney-Gen v The Cloth-
 workers' Co c trial (V C M)

REMAINING CAUSES

Transferred from the MASTER of the ROLLS, and the Vice-
 Chancellor Sir R. MALINS, by Order dat ed 4th April, 1876.
 The Berlin Phosphate Sewage, Alvarez v Barnard act trial
 &c, Co, limd v The Phosphate with wits (M R)
 Sewage Co, limd cause for Evans v Harry act trial with
 trial, with wits (V C M) wits (M R)
 Brown v Burdett c trial with Wohlgenuth v Compton c
 wits (V C M) trial with wits (M R)
 Short v Millett c trial Capper v Chapman act trial
 (V C M) with wits (M R)
 Ebrey v Nelson act trial Barnicot v Hann c trial
 (V C M) (M R)
 Day v Freund act trial Hillman v Mayhew act trial
 (V C M) with wits (M R)
 Andrews v Davison c trial The Widnes Metal Co v
 with wits (M R) Norwood c trial with wits
 Cressley v Cox act trial with (M R)
 wits (M R) Shaw v Norwood c trial with
 Woolley v Woolley m d wits (M R)
 (V C M)

Wright v Wright c trial with
 wits
 Norton v Menzies act trial
 Whitehead v Sandford act trial
 Harrison v Walshall f c
 (short)
 Bell v Cooper act trial
 North Cheshire Brewery Co
 limd v Husband c trial
 Kitchen v Kitchen f c
 Scott v Roy act trial
 Pearson v Cooke c for trial
 Yonge v Luke act for trial
 Siebert v Findlater act for trial
 Vallance v Davies motn for
 judgt
 Plews v Lee c for trial
 Martin v Wale act for trial
 Matthews v Daggett f c
 Warren v McBryde act trial
 Guille v Fox, In re Fox, de-
 ceased, Leonard v Smith f c
 Reeve v Reeve c for trial
 Fearnough v Fennell act
 for trial
 Morrison v Defries act for trial
 Parker v Reeve c for trial
 Crabtree v Mellor f c
 Tams v Riles f c
 Poller v Pegg act for trial
 Lane v Flower, Flower v
 Flower f c
 Buggen v Cramp f c
 Rolls v Pearce sp c
 Naylor v Goodall act for trial
 Meek v Devenish f c
 Lee v Corder act for trial
 (short)
 Hill v Theakstone act t & pet
 Eakridge v Rayner f c
 Tassaud v Elliston act for
 trial
 Sheehan v Houghton act for
 trial
 Clayton v Tomlinson act for
 trial
 Thomas v Howell f c

Holcombe v Adams c trial
 with wits (M R)
 Digby v Floating Swimming
 Baths Co limd c trial

with wits (M R)
 Wood v Edwards c trial
 with wits (M R)

Causes

Set down since Transfer.

Hutchinson v Basham dem of
 deft C R Howard
 The North-Eastern Ry Co v
 Spark act trial with wits
 Bagnall v Carlton c for trial
 with wits
 Leigh v Brewer action for
 trial and motn for judgt
 agnst deft Jno Brewer
 Learys v Cashin action for
 trial
 Hart v Cohen action for trial
 with wits
 De Renter v Gillespie act trial
 Alforth v Espinache c trial
 with wits
 Noble v Edwardes act trial
 with wits
 Edwardes v Noble c trial pt
 hd
 In re Morris Morris v Morris
 act trial
 Marriott v Marriott c trial
 with wits
 The Bangporeh Tea, &c, Co v
 Steuning c trial wits
 Dixon v Rowe sp c

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir CHARLES HALL.

Causes.

Cockle v Joyce exceptions to
 answer
 Fitzroy v Fergusson demurrer
 Forman v Withers demurrer
 Orr v Diaper demurrer
 Dowdeswell v Dowdeswell ex-
 ceptions to answer
 Crompton v Lea m d restored
 Republic of Peru v Ruza m d
 Boynton v Boynton m d re-
 stored
 Austin v Austin m d
 Austin v Koyce m d
 Ranken v Alfaro m d re-
 stored
 The General Insurance Co v
 Kuhnner c with wits
 Hall v Byron c with wits
 Price v Jenkins m d
 Thomas v Ellis m d (revived)
 Titley v Ash c trial with wits
 Latch v Latch (58) m d
 Latch v Latch (26) m d
 Bryant v Maisey act trial
 Phillips v Wigan act trial
 Avery v Avery c trial
 Kingdon v Castleman c with
 wits revived
 Hodgson v Coates c trial
 Watkins v Stuart c trial pro
 confesso
 Cobby v Cobby act trial
 In re Smith Bridson v Smith
 motn judgt
 Rowe v Gray act trial
 Teape v Teape sp c
 Pardee v Griffiths m d
 Griffiths v Pardee m d
 Gibbon v Watson c trial
 Tanner v Sparks m d
 Silber v Rylands & Co, limd
 m d (1874.—S.—No. 241)
 Silber v Rylands & Co, limd
 m d (1875.—S.—26)
 Foster v Lamb c trial
 In re Blades, Blades v Inman
 m judgt
 Petherbridge v Michelmores
 c trial
 Rowe v Lord Charles Ker
 m judgt
 Woodhouse v Woodhouse sp c
 Barnes v Barnes c trial
 Perkins v Perkins m d

Ridgway v Hilton House, &c,
 Colliery Company, limd. c
 trial
 Innes v Marsden act trial
 Barber v Wood act trial
 Cook v Cook c trial
 Hewitt v Hodges c trial
 Green v Carhill act trial
 Wood v Calvert c trial
 In re Eley and Malden v
 Soames act trial
 Wade v Burgess act trial
 Dent v Dent sp c
 Matthews v Smith c trial
 Wane v Fitness c trial
 Macfarlane v Lister act trial
 Harris v Hoare c trial
 Norris v Fowler act trial
 Hartley v Owen act trial
 Wooler v Montague c trial
 Kitchen v Palmer c trial
 Fraser v Bothams c trial
 Porter v Baddeley sp c
 Bell v Charlton act trial
 Rayment v Dimbleby c trial
 Burslem v Crouch act trial
 Price v Timmis c trial
 Jeffreys v Fairs act trial
 Swindell v Birmingham Syndi-
 cate, limd c trial
 Hodges v Fincham m d
 In re Jno Clark, deceased
 Chatterton v Clark act trial
 Thomas v Atherton c wits
 Roberts v Williams act trial
 Marsh v Marsh act trial
 In re Farley, deceased
 Hallett v Hunt m judgt
 Atkinson v Mason act trial
 Attorney-Gen v Mayor, &c, of
 Darlington c
 Steintal v Samson act trial
 In re Carnegie, The Open Stock
 Exchange, limd v Carnegie
 act trial
 In re Pratt, deceased Kirk v
 Pratt act trial
 Rudkin v Dolman act trial
 Buttanshaw v Fletcher c trial
 Birmingham Syndicate limd v
 Swindell c trial
 Chesterfield, &c, Co limd v
 Black act trial
 Howard v Sparrow act trial

Haddon v Bowman c trial
 Terry v Davies c trial
 Turner v Edmunds m d
 Sherry v Anderson act trial
 In re Daniel, deceased Daniel
 v Daniel act trial
 McClean v Brown c trial with
 wife
 Brown v McClean c trial
 Corbett v Lincott m judgt
 Rowe v Jacob act trial
 Leslie v Phillips c trial
 Lavery v Manero act trial
 Rippington v Rippington
 trial
 Attorney-Gen v Tomline m d
 Davidson v Chiboust c trial
 West v Oxenham c trial
 Folkard v Page c trial
 Casson v Dormoy c trial
 Rolfe v MacLaren act trial
 Haniel v Putz act trial
 Gibbs v Burslem act trial
 Hewitt v Westminster Imp
 Commrs act trial
 Wilson v Dickinson c trial
 Fooks v Senior c trial
 Buckle v Weir act trial
 In re Luxton and Hughes'
 Estates Warmington v
 Major m judgt
 Dawson v Bank of Whitehaven
 c trial
 Waburton v Heaven act for
 trial
 Pearson v Harris c for trial
 Heaton v Gerrard act for trial
 and m for judgt
 Smith v Brind c for trial
 Goding v Dudley act for trial
 and m for judgt
 Hedley v Dove c for trial
 Longbourne v Fisher act for
 trial and m for judgt
 Walking v Stace act for trial
 Khuliffa v Forbes m d
 Bentham v Humphreys c for
 trial
 Mawlam v Busby act for trial
 Coleman v Lloyd c for trial
 Wiles v Stace act for trial
 Whitworth v Lancashire, &c,
 Ry Co act for trial
 Whitworth v Longbottom act
 for trial
 Ratcliff v Ratcliff act for trial
 and m for judgt
 Blackburn v Carlton act for
 trial
 King v Matthews c for trial
 The Alliance, &c, Building Co
 v Bent m for judgt
 Re Laity, deceased Laity v
 Laity act for trial
 Rodbard v Cooke act for trial
 Harrison v Pearce act for
 trial
 Cory v Ker act for trial and
 m for judgt
 In re Ross Cundall v Ross
 act for trial
 In re Meynell Moynell v
 Wright act for trial and m
 for judgt
 French v Plumpton act for
 trial
 Wadsworth v Brown c trial
 Roberts v Williams act trial
 Stewart v Hopper c trial
 Ashton v Stock c trial
 Ede v Vyse act trial
 Gael v Gibb m d
 British Dynamite Co limd v
 Krebs c trial
 Whitehall v Holbrooke act
 trial
 Holbrooke v Whitehall act
 trial
 In re Young Young v Dolman
 act trial
 Phipp v Gifford c trial
 Isaac v Wall c trial
 Heard v Heard c trial
 Dawson v Dawson c trial
 Surtees v Malet c trial
 Macdonald v Irvine f c
 Re Walker's Este Church v
 Tyacke act trial
 Lucy v Allen f c
 Aldridge v Aldridge act trial
 & motn judgt
 Stevens v King f c
 Elias v Griffith c trial
 Thurstfield v Nichols f c
 Allen v Bewsey c trial
 Gossett v Campbell act trial
 Frost v Frost f c
 Ware v Petchy f c (short)
 Moses v Gillespie act trial
 Crow v Fewster f c (short)
 Kemp v Bird act trial
 Hulbert v Briggs act trial
 & motn judgt
 Bacon v Bacon c trial
 Teape v Teape f c from cham
 In re Hatley, deceased Green
 v Campbell act trial
 Marson v Caddick f c (short)
 Lonsdale v Lonsdale act trial
 Moulton v Smith act trial
 Porter v Porter f c
 Attorney-General v Tomline
 m d
 Re Warren's Este Warren v
 Tucker act trial
 Evans v Williams act for trial
 Graham v Prosser act for trial
 Smith v Le Kiche act for trial
 Hunter v Eltringham act for
 trial
 Wells v Carr f c
 Watney v Tritt act trial and
 motn for judgt
 Coles v Serocold act trial and
 motn for judgt
 Hirst v Clay f c (short)
 Gardner v Wilkinson f c
 Barrett v Christian f c
 Canning v Green c for trial
 (1875-C-80)
 Canning v Green c for trial
 (1875-C-102)
 Boyle v Millin, Millin v Boyle
 act for trial
 Frost v Brittain f c
 The Alliance Bk limd v Carr,
 Carr v The Alliance Bk limd
 consol acts trial by ord 31st
 May, '76
 Royal National Life Boat In-
 stitution v White f c
 Galton v Clung f c
 Barker v Congreve f c
 Barron v Ruakforth f c
 Haslem v Brown f c
 Re Beauclerk Johnson v
 Beauclerk f c
 Dowager Baroness Stanley of
 Alderley v Earl of Shrews-
 bury f c
 Lancashire and Yorkshire Bank
 v Tee f c
 Chandler v Howell f c
 Hull v Hill f c
 Garrard v Rellly c trial
 Newby v Sharpe act trial with
 wife
 Holliday v Heaton act trial
 Litton v Engleheart act trial
 Pennington v Brinsop Hall
 Coal Co limd c trial

N.B.—This List contains Causes set down to Thursday,
 Oct 26, inclusive.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

November 3, 1876.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

per Cent. Consols, 95½
 Ditto for Account, Nov. 3, 96½
 Do 3 per Cent. Reduced, 95
 New 3 per Cent., 95
 Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94
 Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94
 Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73
 Annuities, Jan. '80 —
 Annuities, April, '83, 9½
 Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1868
 Ex Billa, £1000, 24 per Ct. 25 pm
 Ditto, £500, Do, 25 pm.
 Ditto, £100 & £300, 25 pm.
 Bank of England Stock, — per
 Ct. (last half-year), 235
 Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80, 107½
 Ditto for Account, —
 Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88, 102½
 Ditto, ditto, Certificates —
 Ditto Enfacend Ppr., 4 per Cent. 85
 2nd Inf. Pr., 5 per C., Jan. '72
 Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79, 67
 Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cents,
 April, '64
 Do. Do. 5 per C nt., Aug. '73
 Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
 Ditto, ditto, under £1000

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	—
Stock	Caledonian	100	122
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	106
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	48½
Stock	Great Northern	100	133
Stock	Do., A Stock	100	140½
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	106
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	123½
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	117½
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	21½
Stock	London and North-Western	100	146
Stock	London and South Western	100	125½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	74½
Stock	Metropolitan	100	105½
Stock	Do. District	100	68
Stock	Midland	100	134½
Stock	North British	100	104½
Stock	North Eastern	100	137½
Stock	North London	100	137
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	67
Stock	South Devon	100	69
Stock	South-Eastern	100	125

* A. receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MARRIAGES.

CARTER—LONSDALE—Oct. 31, at the Cathedral Church, Lich-
 field, John Corrie Carter, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-
 law, to Amy Josephine, second daughter of the Rev. John
 Gylby Lonsdale, Canon Residentiary of Lichfield.

GARDOM—VINES—Oct. 24, at the parish church, Wanstead-
 Essex, Edward Theodore Gardom, of Gloucester, solicitor,
 fourth son of the late John Williams Gardom, of Butterton-
 park, North Staffordshire, to Florence Marian, third daughter
 of Charles Richard Vines, of East Lodge, Wanstead.

STAMP—JAMES—Oct. 25, at St. Paul's Church, Honiton,
 Edmund Archibald Stamp, solicitor, Honiton, to Ada Cun-
 ningham, youngest daughter of the Rev. Wm. James, B.D.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Oct. 31, 1876.

Elcum, Hugh W., and James B. Hocombe, '13, Bedford-row, Holborn,
 Middlesex, Attorneys and Solicitors. Oct 34

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1876.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Bodfari Hematite Iron Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for wind-
 ing up, presented Aug 24, directed to be heard before the V.C. on
 Nov 7. Gee, Liverpool, solicitor.

Liverpool United Land and Building Company, Limited.—Petition for
 winding up, presented Oct 2, directed to be heard before the V.C. on
 Nov 7. Bateson and Co, Liverpool, solicitors for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, Oct. 31, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

British Colonial Trust Corporation, Limited.—The M.R. has fixed Nov
 8, at 11.30, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official
 liquidator.

General Sewage and Manure Company, Limited.—The M.R. has fixed
 Thursday, Nov 9, at 12, at his chambers, for the appointment of an
 official liquidator.

G. and J. Brown and Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 30, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on Nov 10. Gole Lime st, agents for Oxley and Pashley, Rotherham, York, solicitors for the petitioner.

Liverpool and Continental Steamship Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 26, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Nov 11. Tockne, Aldermanbury, solicitor for the petitioner.

New Rosario Silver Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 28, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on Nov 10. Tillyard, King st, Chapsalide, solicitor for the petitioner.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1876.

Cockle, Thomas, Hilbrow, Haddenham, Cambridge, Farmer. Nov 27.
Cockle v Brown, M.R. Wayman, Cambridge

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1876.

Baker, Henry, Maldon Hall, Essex, Esq. Nov 28. Pope, Colchester
Blood, Joseph Howell, Witham, Essex, Gent. Jan 1. Blood, Witham
Bencey, Charles, Roupell st, Lambeth, Licensed Victualler. Nov 27.
Farmer and Robbins, Pancras lane
Burwash, David, King William st, Notary Public. Nov 30. Blunt
and Co, Gresham st
Dutton, John, Burland Hall, Cheshire, Farmer. Dec 24. Bridgman
and Co, Chester
Fairs, Joseph, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Chemist. Dec 9. Chartres and
Toall, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Hall, Mary Ann, Grange, Lancashire. Dec 23. Sharp and Son,
Lancaster
James, Richard, Hertford, Esq. Nov 30. Blunt and Co, Gresham st
Julian, Mordaunt, St Luke's rd villas, Westbourne park, Esq. Nov 25.
McClellan, Bedford row
Julius, Emily, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex. Nov 30. Potter and
Stevens, Farnham
Law, Ann, Sheffield. Dec 31. Auty and Son, Sheffield
Lodge, John, Les, Gloucester, Innkeeper. Nov 30. Coleman, Gloucester
Longfield, Joseph, Leeds, Chemist. Dec 1. Cranswick, Leeds
Manger, Thomas, Buckland, Dover, Gent. Dec 19. Clarris, Dover
Newton, Caroline, Springfield row, St John's wood. Dec 16. Flad-
gate and Co, Craven st, Strand
Pritchard, Taylor, Camden rd, Holloway, Esq. Dec 1. Shephard and
Sons, Finsbury circus
Robinson, Robert, Liddington, Bedford, Tailor. Dec 1. Maule and
Barton, Huntingdon
Smith, John, Halesworth, Suffolk, Gent. Nov 6. Muskett and Garrod,
Diss
Solomon, Simon, Bristol, Gent. Dec 28. Plummer, Bristol
Spratt, Isaac, Brook st, Hanover sq, Toyman. Nov 30. Low, W im-
pole st, Cavendish sq
Tall, George, Lydd, Kent, Hairdresser. Nov 35. Stringer, New
Romey
Trenfield, William, Gloucester, Gent. Dec 2. John Trenfield, Chip-
ping Sodbury
Way, Edward, Strand, Tobacconist. Dec 14. Morton and Cutler,
Newgate st
Wilkinson, Joseph, Earby, York, Farmer. Dec 2. Robinson, Skipton
Wilkinson, Richard, Chesterfield, Derby, Licensed Victualler. Dec 23.
Gratton, Chesterfield
Williams, Thomas Robert, Holland st, Clapham rd, Esq. Nov 26.
Morley and Shireff, Palmerston buildings, Old Broad st
Willson, Alexander Selwyn Stewart, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Esq.
Nov 30. Gale, Cheltenham
Winter, James, Wardour st, Soho, Furniture Dealer. Dec 30. Lane,
Bedford place, Russell sq

TUESDAY, Oct. 31, 1876.

Beckett, George, Halton, Cheshire, Gent. Nov 30. Fletcher, North-
wich
Binns, George, Sheffield, Grocer. Dec 10. Simpson, Sheffield
Blood, Joseph Howell, Witham, Essex, Gent. Jan 1. Blood, Witham
Bostock, William, Liverpool, Seaman. Jan 25. Whitaker, Lancaster
place, Strand
Butcher, Willi m, Waverley place, St John's wood, Gent. Dec 1.
Bennett, Furnival's inn
Chambers, Caroline, otherwise Caroline Felton, Hanover st, Pimlico.
Dec 4. Beale and Co, Birmingham
Bury, Henry, Branksome Tower, Dorset, Esq. Dec 31. Swinburne
and Parker, Bedford row
Clark, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Boot Maker. Dec 27. Clark,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Carrham, Thomas, Wolverhampton, Fruit Dealer. Dec 30. Riley,
Wolverhampton
Firbank, Jane, Caney hill, Durham. Nov 30. Trotter and Co, Bishop
Auckland
Fitzclarence, Lady Augusta, Etal Manor House, Northumberland. Nov
30. Sanderson, Berwick-upon-Tweed
Fletcher, Aaron, Brimington, Derry, Gent. Dec. 23. Gratton,
Chesterfield
Fleury, Margaret, Everton, Liverpool. Nov 27. Dodge and Phipps,
Liverpool
Grey, Georgiana Smith, Blackheath, Kent. Dec 30. Burn and Gallo-
way, Gresham st
Johnston, Frances Anne, Liverpool. Dec 1. Waugh, Cocker mouth
Jener, William, Aberdare, Plasterer. Dec 1. Heard, Cardiff
Julian, Mordaunt, St Luke's rd villas, Westbourne park, Esq. Nov
25. McClellan, Bedford row
Kell, Robert Henry van Wart, Avondale, New Zealand, Sheep Farmer.
Nov 27. Van Wart, Birmingham
Morrell, John, Alpha villas, Upper Holloway, Gent. Nov 30. Gratton,
Croydon

Morris, Edwin Major, Great Witcombe, Gloucestershire, Publican.
Dec 18. Mullings and Co, Cirencester
Moody, Thomas Arthur Berlie, St James's place, St James's. Dec 25.
Balderton, Bedford row
Page, Henry, Norfolk sq, Paddington, Merchant. Nov 30. Humphreys,
Giltspur chambers, Holborn viaduct
Phillipson, William, Staveley, Westmorland, Bobbin Manufacturer.
Dec 13. Thomson and Wilson, Kendal
Robertson, Mary, Hollington, Sussex. Dec 9. Jones, Hastings
Sanderson, Richard Burdon, Budle House, Northumberland, Esq.
Dec 12. Watson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Scott, Harriet, Lorrimer rd, Walworth. Dec 1. Dawes and Sons,
Angel court, Throgmorton st
Spowers, Allan, Queensborough terrace, Bayswater, Esq. Dec 1.
Gabriel, Lincoln's inn fields
Sugg, Sarah Hatchard Taylor, Leighton court rd, West Streatham.
Dec 30. Crose, Lancaster place, Strand
Thornton, Sarah, Yardley, Worcester. Dec 4. Beale and Co, Bir-
mingham
Wilson, Marmaduke Charles, Ealing, Middlesex, Esq. Dec 11. Aston,
Edgware rd

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.
To Surrender in London.

Drinkwater, Herbert Charles, Westminster chambers, Victoria st. Pet
Oct 25. Spring-Rice. Nov 14 at 1
Lockwood, Charles, Paul's alley, St Paul's churchyard, Tailor. Pet
Oct 24. Brougham. Nov 8 at 2
Mailis, Emanuel Antonio, Union court, Old Broad st, Sponge im-
porter. Pet Oct 24. Brougham. Nov 7 at 1
Tarrant, Edwin, Southgate rd, Timber Merchant. Pet Oct 24.
Brougham. Nov 7 at 2

To Surrender in the Country.

Bettridge, James, Newport, Monmouth, Fish Salesman. Pet Oct 25.
Davis. Newport, Nov 15 at 11
Elliott, Jane, Ainsley rd, Norwood, Baker. Pet Oct 9. Rowland,
Croydon, Nov 10 at 2
Fielden, Samuel, Walsden, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. Pet Oct 23.
Hartley, Burnley, Nov 7 at 11
Williams, Charles, Lower Porton Farm, Monmouth, Farmer. Pet Oct
25. Davis. Newport, Nov 10 at 11
Winchcombe, Arthur, Pembroke Dock, Pembroke, Publican. Pet Oct
24. Lloyd. Carmarthen, Nov 7 at 2

TUESDAY, Oct. 31, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Buckler, Thomas Warr, Fenchurch st, Solicitor. Pet Oct 27. Spring-
rice. Nov 13 at 11
Lyons, George Joseph, Ostend, Belgium. Pet Oct 27. Spring-Rice.
Nov 15 at 12
Terry, J W, Salters' Hall court, Cannon st, Coal Merchant.
Pet Oct 27. Spring-Rice. Nov 15 at 11.30
Throckmorton, Richard, Saville row, Burlington gardens. Pet Oct
26. Brougham. Nov 15 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Boff, Henry, and George Boff, Hertford, Builders. Pet Oct 27. Edwards.
St Albans, Nov 15 at 3
Dawson, James, Kingston-upon-Hull, Coal Merchant. Pet Oct 24.
Rollit, Kingston-upon-Hull, Nov 15 at 3
Graham, McLean, Hampton Court. Pet Oct 10. Bell. King-
ston-Thames, Nov 15 at 3
Owen, Griffith, Vauxhall Wren, Anglesey, Farmer. Pet Oct 26. Jones.
Bangor, Nov 13 at 2

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1876.

Addison, Robert Pallett, Wimbington, Cambridge, Farmer. Nov 10 at
1 at the Obequee Jan, March. Giza, Cambridge
Austin, Joseph Francis, Birkenhead, out of business. Nov 9 at 11 at
offices of Thompson and Simm, Hamilton sq, Birkenhead. Downham,
Birkenhead
Auty, Charles, Wistow, York, Grocer. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of
Crowther, Oxford place, Leeds. Rhodes, South Milford
Bagley, William, Birmingham, Grocer. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Jaques,
Cherry st, Birmingham
Baker, James William, Bradford, York, Farmer. Nov 8 at 3 at offices
of Broomhead and Co, Bank chambers, George st, Sheffield
Bazeley, John William, Birmingham, Baker. Nov 9 at 12 at offices of
Phillips, Moor st, Birmingham
Belton, John, Nottingham, Painter. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Belt,
Middle pavement, Nottingham
Blackledge, John, Chorley, Lancashire, Fruiterer. Nov 8 at 11 at
offices of Morris, Town Hall chambers, Uxbridge
Booth, Obadiah, Accrington, Builder. Nov 9 at 10.30 at the Har-
greaves Arms Hotel, Accrington. Ballard, Accrington
Bruton, George James, Sheffield, Buff Manufacturer. Nov 9 at 2 at
offices of Fairbairn, Bank st, Sheffield
Calcutt, William, Green st, Bethnal green, Leather Dealer. Nov 11
at 11 at offices of Hicks, Globe rd, Mile End
Canning, Benjamin, Bristol, Cabinet Manufacturer. Nov 10 at 2 at
offices of Collins, Jun, Broad st, Bristol. Salmon and Henderson,
Bristol
Chipchase, William, Redcar, York, Brick Manufacturer. Nov 11 at 11
at Griffiths Temperance Hotel, Lintorpe rd, Middlesborough. Bain-
bridge, Middlesborough
Clayton, Thomas Waterhouse, Cornborough, York, Farmer. Nov 7 at
2 at offices of Anderson, Stonegate, York
Cohen, Hermann, Liverpool, Oilar Dealer. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of
Norton, Cook st, Liverpool
Coleman, John, Beaufort buildings, Strand, Theatrical Manager. Nov
10 at 2 at offices of Peapoint, Leicester sq
Combe, Tom, Lincoln, Leather Seller. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Jay,
Bank st, Lincoln. Page, Jun, Lincoln

Curson, Isaac, and George Quintus Meadows, Wisbech, Cambridge, Aerated Water Manufacturers. Nov 9 at 1 at the Ship Inn, Wisbech.

Deacon and Wilkins, Peterborough

Dale, James, Shanklin, Isle of Wight, Fruiterer. Nov 7 at 3 at offices of Urry, High st, Shanklin

Davies, Caroline, Leeds, Hosier. Nov 8 at 3 at offices of Hopps and Bedford, Bank st, Leeds

Edin, Henry Robert, Liverpool, Gent. Nov 7 at 10 at offices of Transpauure, Adelaide buildings, Lime st, Liverpool. Last, Liverpool

Egan, James Edward, Liverpool, Grocer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Nordon, Cook st, Liverpool

Evans, William Evan, Llandudno Carnarvon, Licensed Victualler. Nov 11 at 12 at the Queen Hotel, Chester. Chamberlain, Llandudno

Ford, William, Clerkenwell green, Lapidary. Nov 11 at 10.30 at offices of Evans and Eagles, John st, Bedford row

Forge, Frederick, Hulme, Auctioneer. Nov 16 at 11 at offices of Smith King st, Manchester

Fozall, Eli, and John Fozall, Bewtle, nr Liverpool, Shipsmiths. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Forrest, Fennell st, Liverpool

Fursey, Eliza, St Woolas, Monmouth, Ironmonger. Nov 9 at 12 at offices of Williams, Commercial st, Newport. Jenkins, Newport

Gough, Francis Pelling, Blookley, Worcester, Commission Agent. Nov 9 at 12 at offices of New and Co, Bridge st, Evesham

Graham, Edward, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grocer. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Keenlyde and Foster, St John's chambers, Grainger st west, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Hayward, Edgar Francis, King's rd, Chelsea, Hosier. Nov 8 at 2 at offices of Phelps and Co, Greenwich

Hea, Robert, Barrow-in-Furness, Grocer. Nov 10 at 2 at Sharp's Hotel, Strand, Barrow-in-Furness. Taylor, Barrow-in-Furness

Hentchell, August, and Peter Brooks, London Fields, Hackney, Paper Collar Manufacturers. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Menagui, Bucklers-bury

Hollinrake, Smith, Burnley, Cotton Manufacturer. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Roberts, Maraden st, Manchester

Holloway, John, Cardiff, Coach Builder. Nov 7 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff

Hudson, Simon Alfred, Birmingham, Draper. Nov 8 at 11 at offices of Rowlands, Ann st, Birmingham

Hughes, Edward, New Brompton, Kent, Grocer. Nov 1 at 12 at offices of Prall, High st, Rochester

Hunt, Jonas, Hyson green, Nottingham, Silk Winder. Nov 8 at 3 at offices of Belk, Middle pavement, Nottingham

Huntley, Vinton, South Shields, Draper. Nov 8 at 3 at offices of Smith, Savile st, North Shields

Ireland, Charles Frederick, De Beauvoir rd, Kingland, Skirt Manufacturer. Nov 9 at 12 at offices of Nelson, Basinghall st. Kynaston and Gagneul, Queen st

Jackson, Beetham, Bow lane, Cheapside, Warehouseman. Nov 13 at 2 at 111, Cheapside. Gowing and Mandala, King st, Cheapside

James, Isaac William, Barstrees court, Hereford, Farmer. Nov 9 at 1 at offices of Stallard, East st, Hereford

James, John, St Colum, Cornwall, Butcher. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Whitefield, St Colum

Jessop, Josiah Benjamin, Wolverhampton, Chemist. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Duke, Temple row, Birmingham

Kirk, George, Lincoln, Bookseller. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Jay, Bank st, Lincoln

Kruse, Charles, Sheffield, Builder. Nov 7 at 11 at offices of Porrett, Queen st, Sheffield

Lewis, Samuel, Wednesbury, Stafford, Mill Furnaceman. Nov 13 at 3.30 at offices of Sheldon, High st, Wednesbury

Liebhmann, Maximilian, Bradford, Shipping Merchant. Nov 8 at 11 at offices of Wood and Kulick, Commercial Bank buildings, Bradford

Mathison, Robert, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Cooper. Nov 6 at 2 at offices of Weddell, Berwick-upon-Tweed

May, Edwin Woodward, Newport, Isle of Wight, Confectioner. Nov 17 at 1 at the Star Hotel, Newport. Hooper, Newport

Miller, Edmund, Birmingham, Master Hauler. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham

Milton, James, and Matthew Curnow, Bristol, Grocers. Nov 8 at 2 at offices of Hunt and Co, Bristol chambers, Nicholas st, Bristol

Morgan, Edwin, Bream, Gloucester, Plumber. Nov 11 at 1 at offices of Jackson, Westgate st, Gloucester

Morris, Henry Vaughan, Blue Anchor rd, Bermondsey, Outfitter. Nov 7 at 3 at offices of Goldberg, West st, Moorgate st

Oliver, Mary, Northchurch, Hertford, Innkeeper. Nov 15 at 11.30 at offices of Bullock, Great Berkhamstead

Parrington, William Hudson, Essex rd, Islington, Tailor. Nov 4 at 1 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Hicks, London wall

Phillimore, Edward, sen, Hullavington, Wilts, Farmer. Nov 6 at 11 at the George Hotel, High st, Cheltenham. Taynton and Son, Gloucester

Plummer, Grace, Harrogate, York, Fishmonger. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Watson, Lendal

Reynolds, Alfred, Temple st, Whitefriars, Smith. Nov 10 at 2 at offices of Baxter, Laurence Pountney hill, Cannon st

Rhodes, Caleb, and William Rhodes, Meend, Gloucester, Builders. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Dighton, Mitcheldean

Riley, James, Ilkeston, Derby, Grocer. Nov 15 at 11 at the Rutland Hotel, Ilkeston

Robertson, Henry, William st, Curtain rd, Mason. Nov 16 at 4 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Islington. Fenton

Rooke, John, Goole, York, Green grocer. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Hind, Goole

Ryder, Alfred, Crook, Durham, Builder. Nov 10 at 1 at offices of Slater, Newgate st, Bishop Auckland

Saunders, Frederick, Newtown, Isle of Wight. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Fardell, Cambrian House, Ryde

Scholey, William John, Gateshead, Durham, Hatter. Nov 9 at 12 at offices of Bush, Wellington st, Gateshead

Slade, Henry George, Cophall court, Stock Broker. Nov 7 at 11 at offices of Sole and Co, Aldermanbury

Smith, Edwin, Birmingham, Grocer. Nov 6 at 3 at offices of Duke, Temple row, Birmingham

Smith, Robert, Bradford, Draper. Nov 9 at 10 at offices of Berry and Robinson, Charles st, Bradford

Smith, Thomas, Stratford-on-Avon, Warwick, Butcher. Nov 7 at 11.30 at the Unicorn Inn, Stratford-on-Avon. Warden, Stratford-on-Avon

Smith, William, and John Morgan, Gillingtoe, Bradford, Drapers. Nov 12 at 10 at offices of Hutchinson, Piccadilly, Bradford

Smith, William, John Smith, and Shadrach Lewis, Maesteg, Glamorgan, Builders. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Tennant and Jones, Aber-avon

Stanton, George, East India chambers, Leadenhall st, Shipowner. Nov 20 at 12 at offices of Smart and Co, Cheapside. Lowless and Co

Sykes, Ben jamin, Huddersfield, Waste Opener. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Berry, Market place, Huddersfield

Thompson, Joseph, and John Thompson, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Lemonade Manufacturers. Nov 16 at 12 at offices of Trotter and Co, North Bondgate, Bishop Auckland

Viles, James, Aston, nr Birmingham, Grocer. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Asander, Union st, Birmingham

Ward, James, Defford, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Pitt, Avenue, Cross, Worcester

Weech, Robert William Henry, and Frederick Barclay Hanbury, Savage gardens, Tower hill, Commission Merchants. Nov 20 at 2 at the Terminus Hotel, Cannon st. Paine and Co, Gresham House

Warrington, George, Liverpool, Tea Merchant. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Ponton, Vernon st, Liverpool

Weston, Mary Ann, Kirkdale, Liverpool, Glass Dealer. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Masters and Fletcher, North John st, Liverpool

Wilkins, James, and Thomas Wilkins, Chatham, Kent, Builders. Nov 7 at 2.30 at the Sun Hotel, Chatham

Wilson, John, Liverpool, Boot Maker. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Nordon, Cook st, Liverpool

Wilson, John, Glusburn, York, Manufacturer of Worsteds Goods. Nov 10 at 2 at offices of Wright and Waterworth, Devonshire buildings, Keighley

Wood, Charles, Leeds, Beerhouse Keeper. Nov 8 at 3 at the Commercial Hotel, Albion st, Leeds. Horner, Wakefield

Woodman, Arthur Frederick, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Milliner. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Tinsley, Priory st, Dudley

York, John, Minton, Lincoln, Farmer. Nov 11 at 12 at offices of Toyhbe and Co, Bank st, Lincoln

TUESDAY, Oct. 31, 1876.

Allen, William, Leicester, Joiner. Nov 14 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Seaborne buildings, Millstone lane, Leicester

Arkell, Thomas, Upton, Warwick, Farmer. Nov 17 at 12 at offices of Passman, Lower Bedford st, Leamington

Armstrong, Patrick, Manchester, Slate Merchant. Nov 20 at 3 at offices of Credland, John Dalton st, Manchester

Ashworth, Richard, Little Lever, Lancashire, Grocer. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Green, Brazenosse st, Manchester. Bowden, Manchester

Atherton, Thomas, Prescot, Lancashire, Plumber. Nov 16 at 2 at offices of Tyrer, Viarage place, Prescot

Bayley, Robert, Bourne-mouth, Ironmonger. Nov 11 at 1 at the Inns of Court Hotel, High Holborn. Travention, Poole

Bennett, Joseph, Lambeth sq, out of business. Nov 9 at 1 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue. King, Fish st hill

Bennett, William, Hanley, Medical Botanist. Nov 10 at 10 at the Copeland Arms Inn, Stoke-upon-Trent

Benoit, Charles, Archer st, Westbourne grove, Upholsterer. Nov 9 at 3 at offices of Lewis, Moorgate st

Bloomfield, John Reed, Stamford rd, Blackfriars, Greengrocer. Nov 9 at 10 at offices of Kitch, Argyll place, Regent st

Brierley, Benjamin, Rochdale, Greengrocer. Nov 15 at 3 at the Commercial Hotel, Brown st, Manchester. Ashworth, Rochdale

Brunton, Cuthbert, Spennymoor, Durham, Carter. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Maw, Jun, High Bondgate, Bishop Auckland

Buckley, John, Lees, nr Oldham, Grocer. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Sampson, South King st, Manchester

Bullen, Henry, Southampton, Oil Merchant. Nov 8 at 3 at offices of Shutte, Portland st, Southampton

Carr, Thomas, Langley Moor, Durham, Grocer. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Chapman, St Nicholas sq, Market place, Durham

Child, Edward, Joseph Robert Child, and Nathaniel Dean, Bath, Wine Merchants. Nov 14 at 11 at offices of Dyer, Queen sq, Bath

Clark, Charles, Wolverhampton, File Cutter. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Dallow, Queen sq, Wolverhampton

Clarkson, William, Weymouth terrace, Hackney rd, Boot Manufacturer. Nov 8 at 3 at offices of Parke, Colebrooke row, Islington

Clarkson, William, Birkenhead, Confectioner. Nov 13 at 2 at offices of Downham, Market st, Birkenhead

Comber, Thomas James, Fleet st, Jeweller. Nov 15 at 12 at offices of Frennall, Old Jewry

Cossey, George, Ruckhenth, Norfolk, Bricklayer. Nov 9 at 10 at offices of Stanley, Bank plain, Norwich

Costar, Sarah Ann, Barneley, out of business. Nov 23 at 11 at offices of Freeman, Church st, Barneley

Cumby, Thomas, Chobham, Surrey, Gas Manufacturer. Nov 25 at 2 at 37, Bedford row. Marshall

Cussons, George Smith, Kingston-upon-Hull, Fancy Stationer. Nov 13 at 2 at offices of Bell and Co, Bow Churchyard, Cheapside. Reeds

Davies, Edward, Manchester, Engine Fitter. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Horner, St Mary's st, Deansgate, Manchester

Davies, William, Swansea, Fruiterer. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Donaghy, Worcester place, Swansea

Davis, Alfred, High st, Camden town, Glass Dealer. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Banks, Coleman st. Stopher, Coleman st

Davis, William James, Newport, Salop, Saddler. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Smallwood, Newport

Dawes, William, Wednesbury, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Slater and Marshall, Butcroft, Darlington

Dill, John, Stretford, Lancashire, Doctor of Medicine. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Simpson, South gate, Lower King st, Manchester

Dixon, Lancelot Bush, and Frederick Lowry Richardson, Liverpool, Stationers. Nov 14 at 12 at the Law Association Rooms, Cook st, Liverpool. Harris, Liverpool

Dormer, Charles Edwin, Gresham st west, Baby Linen Manufacturer. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Minton and Co, Carey lane, General Post Office

Douglas, George Boyce, Bolton-le-Moors, Lancashire, Doctor of Medicine. Nov 20 at 11 at offices of Whitt, King st, Manchester. Whitehead, Manchester.

Dowse, Thomas, Westhoughton, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Stuart, King st, Wigan.

Edgar, Thomas, Blackpool, Journeyman Joiner. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Morgan, Church st, Blackpool.

Edwards, George, Worcester, Boot Manufacturer. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Pitt, The Avenue, Cross, Worcester.

Ellis, Henry, Norwich, Shoemaker. Nov 7 at 12 at offices of Taylor and Sons, Old Bank buildings, Upper King st, Norwich.

Fishwick, William, Gainsborough, York, Builder. Nov 15 at 3 at Griffiths' Temperance Hotel, Linthorpe rd, Middlesbrough. Bainbridge, Middlesbrough.

Fleming, Mary, Derby, Smallware Dealer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Grotton, Corn market, Derby.

French, Thomas, Barnet grove, Bethnal green rd, Boot Manufacturer. Nov 8 at 10 at offices of Hicks, Lansdown terrace, Grove rd, Victoria park.

Fuller, Charles, Asken-in-Furness, Lancashire, Grocer. Nov 14 at 2 at Sharp's Hotel, Strand, Barrow-in-Furness. Taylor, Barrow-in-Furness.

Gant, William, Blaenauvon, Monmouth, Innkeeper. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Watkins, Pontypool.

Gell, John, Bedford, Moulifer. Nov 13 at 12 at offices of Conquest and Clare, Duke st, Bedford.

Gerard, Henry Martin, Bewdley, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Talbot, Church st, Kidderminster.

Gilbert, John, Birmingham, Baker. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Buller and Bickley, Bennett's hill, Birmingham.

Glasbrook, James, Trannere, Cheshire, Mariner. Nov 11 at 12 at offices of Killey, Lord st, Liverpool.

Greig, Lawrence, Percy, Verulam buildings, Gray's inn, out of business.

Nov 14 at 2 at offices of Sydney, Finsbury circus.

Grover, Henry, Beverley, York, Gent. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Robinson and Son, North bar within, Beverley. Eldridge and Stephenson.

Guy, John Richard, Southsea, Hants, Builder. Nov 11 at 4 at offices of Waincoat, Union st, Portsea. King, Portsea.

Hardcastle, Thomas, Undercliffe, Bradford, Woolsorter. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Market st, Bradford.

Harding, Samuel, Stone, Stafford, Manager to a Shoemaker, Nov 8 at 3 at the Robin Hood, Church st, Stone. Hutchinson, King st, Chesapeake.

Harris, Richard, Neath, Glamorgan, Boot maker. Nov 14 at 1 at office of Seale, London rd, Neath.

Hartopp, Richard, Kidderminster, Coal Dealer. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Miller and Co, Church st, Kidderminster.

Haworth, Enoch, Accrington, Grocer. Nov 13 at 3 at the Crown Hotel, Blackburn rd, Accrington. Ballard, Accrington.

Haslewood, Henry, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Watchmaker. Nov 14 at 12 at offices of Nichols and Leatherdale, Jewry chambers, Old Jewry, Brooks.

Hewson, Thomas, Kingston-upon-Hull, Dealer in Granite. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Summers, Manor st, Kingston-upon-Hull.

Hirst, John, Birkenhead, Grocer. Nov 14 at 11 at offices of Mawson, Duncan st, Birkenhead. Anderson, Birkenhead.

Holden, William Vario, Manchester, Paper Merchant. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Sampson, South King st, Manchester.

Horsfall, John, Bradford Moor, York, out of business. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Wilkinson, Kirkgate, Bradford.

Houghton, John William, Holly st, Dalton, Builder. Nov 7 at 11 at offices of Wildash, Salters' Hall court, Cannon st.

Hughes, Charles William, Birmingham, Grocer. Nov 15 at 12 at offices of Hawkes and Weekes, Temple st, Birmingham.

Hughes, Ellis, Glyncorr Fawr, Carnarvon, Flour Merchant. Nov 15 at 1 at the Alexandra Hotel, Dale st, Liverpool. Allanson, Carnarvon.

Hunter, William, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Maher and Poncia, Temple st, Birmingham.

Ince, George Erskine, Sheffield, out of business. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Clegg and Sons, Bank st, Sheffield.

Kay, Thomas, Inake, York, Joiner. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Burdekin and Co, Norfolk st, Sheffield.

Lawson, John, Maryport, Cumberland, Schoolmaster. Nov 11 at 11 at 27, Kirby st, Maryport. Collin, Maryport.

Lewis, George Edward, Liverpool. Nov 15 at 2 at the rooms of the Law Society, Cook st, Liverpool. Atkinson, Liverpool.

Lovell, Samuel Young, Leamington, Warwick, Commission Agent. Nov 2 at 11 at offices of Abbott, Spencer st, Leamington.

Lowther, William Arthur, Old Basford, Nottingham, Tailor. Nov 14 at 12 at offices of Bell, Middle pavement, Nottingham.

Martin, Henry, Hereford, out of business. Nov 11 at 10.30 at offices of James and Edenham, St Peter st, Hereford.

McGuinn, John, South Shields, Durham, Licensed Victualler. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Scott, King st, South Shields.

McNicholas, Michael, Bolton, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Hall, Acrofield, Bolton.

Müller, Alfred Phoenix, Redhill, House Decorator. Nov 13 at 1 at offices of Hubbard, London Joint Stock Bank chambers, Charterhouse st.

Millington, George Emery, Bliston, Stafford, Tailor. Nov 13 at 10 at offices of Hall, Lichfield st, Bliston.

Morgan, William Wray, Barbican, Printer. Nov 11 at 12 at offices of Bell and Co, Queen Victoria st.

Mowbray, Alfred Thornton, Leicester, Builder. Nov 13 at 12 at offices of Fowler and Co, Friar lane, Leicester.

Mulford, Thomas, Bristol, Coal Merchant. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Hare, Exchange buildings east, Bristol. Bernard, Bristol.

Newbold, John Davison, Lincoln, Rag Merchant. Nov 15 at 2 at offices of Durance, Mint lane, Lincoln.

O'Connor, Garrett, Waterloo, Lancashire, Boot Maker. Nov 16 at 3 at offices of Hilton, Dale st, Liverpool.

Osell, Thomas Motley, Southampton st, Camberwell, Grocer. Nov 11 at 10.30 at offices of Fanner and Co, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st. Stopher, Coleman st.

Olliphant, Henry William, St Edmund's terrace, St John's wood, no occupation. Nov 11 at 1 at offices of Apps, South sq, Gray's inn.

Page, Jesse, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex, Coal Merchant. Nov 10 at 12 at offices of Jones, Harold place, Hastings.

Parkinson, Gilderdale John, Mossley rd, nr Birmingham, Agent. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Saunders and Bradbury, Temple row, Birmingham.

Peach, William, Derby, Accountant. Nov 20 at 3 at offices of Leach, St James's st, Derby.

Powell, Ann, Broad Blunsdon, Wilts, Beer Retailer. Nov 13 at 11 at the Great Western Hotel, New Swindon. Lovett, Cricklands.

Powell, Charles, Pwll-y-don, Glamorgan, Builder. Nov 20 at 11 at offices of Thomas, Rat and st, Swansea.

Pyke, Alexander Samuel, Ely place, Holborn, Jeweller. Nov 27 at 3 at offices of Lewis and Lewis, Ely place, Holborn.

Ranger, Frederick, Chippenham, Wilts, Innkeeper. Nov 14 at 12 at the King's Head Inn, Chippenham. Wood, Chippenham.

Richardson, William, Stretford, Lancashire, Clock Maker. Nov 22 at 3 at offices of Horner, Clarence st, Manchester.

Robinson, Abraham, Middlessex st, Aldgate, Furrier. Nov 16 at 2 at offices of Gilt, Chesapeake.

Rodderd, John, Preston Plucknett, Somerset, out of business. Nov 15 at 12 at the Hall Moon Inn, King st, Melcombe Regis, Weymouth.

Glyde, Yeovil.

Ruston, William Seward, Chatteris, Cambridge, Coal Agent. Nov 15 at 2 at offices of Wallingford and Co, St Ives.

Scattergood, Edward, Dudley, Worcester, Boiler Manufacturer. Nov 14 at 12 at offices of Burton, Union passage, Birmingham.

Sharp, Robert Henry, Sheffield, Coal Merchant. Nov 14 at 2 at offices of Macredie and Evans, George st, Sheffield. Rhodes.

Sheen, William, Ockendon rd, Horse Dealer's Assistant. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Ricketts, Frederick st, Gray's inn rd.

Sherwin, Thomas, Hinckley, Leicester, Manufacturer of Cotton Hosiery. Nov 11 at 11 at the Craven Arms Hotel, Coventry. Homer, Coventry.

Stable, Frederick Smyth, Kent, Licensed Victualler. Nov 15 at 3 at the Ordnance Arms, Hythe. Minter, Folkestone.

Smith, William, Brighton, Sussex, Chemist. Nov 11 at 1 at offices of Clennell and Fraser, Great James st, Bedford row. Nye, Brighton.

Soley, Bonnor, Omberville, Worcester, Builder. Nov 8 at 3 at offices of Corbett, Avenue House, Worcester.

Szeeds, Thomas, Clapton Farm, Clapton, Somerset, Yeoman. Nov 13 at 12 at offices of Marly and Sons, Old Post Office chambers, Corn st, Bristol.

Thompson, George, Darlington, Durham, Wood Dealer. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Robinson, Houndgate, Darlington.

Thorne, Francis, Lancaster, Cornwall, Ironmonger. Nov 10 at 11 at offices of Square, George st, Plymouth.

Towell, Frederick, Birmingham, Carpenter. Nov 11 at 12 at offices of Smith, Temple st, Birmingham.

Tuckett, Sophia Louisa, Bristol, Lodging house Keeper. Nov 11 at 12 at offices of Sherrard, Baldwin st, Bristol.

Vogt, Alfred Fiddle, Northampton, Jeweller. Nov 10 at 3 at offices of Ashdowne, The Drapery, Northampton.

Walsh, James Bottomley, Halifax, Plumber. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Wavell and Co, Halifax.

Warr, Alfred, Newport, Mon., Undertaker. Nov 13 at 1 at offices of Tribes and Co, High st, Newport. Williams and Co, Newport.

Watkinson, William, Huddersfield, Fancy Goods Dealer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Mills, Byram buildings, Westgate, Huddersfield.

Willis, William Pomeroy, West Moulsey, Surrey, Farmer. Nov 14 at 1 at the Law Institution, Chancery lane. Stollard, South Molton st.

Wilson, George, Shipley, York, Grocer. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Wilkinson, Kirkgate, Bradford.

Wood, Alfred, Trannere, Cheshire, Grocer. Nov 13 at 2 at offices of Thompson and Simm, Hamilton sq, Birkenhead. Anderson.

Wood, William Hamilton, Salford, Lancashire, Engineer. Nov 14 at 3 at the Mire Hotel, Cathedral gates, Manchester. McOwen, Manchester.

Young, Tonkin, and James Young, St Ives, Cornwall, Merchants. Nov 10 at 11.30 at offices of Rodd and Cornish, Parade st, Penzance. Paul, Truro.

CHARLEY'S REAL PROPERTY ACTS.—Third Edition.

Just published, demy 12mo, price 12s., cloth.

THE REAL PROPERTY ACTS, 1874, 1875, and 1876; 37 & 38 Vict. cc. 33, 37, 57, 78 (Settled Estates Act, Powers Law Amendment Act, Limitation Act, and Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874); 39 & 40 Vict. c. 87 (Land Transfer Act, 1875); 39 & 40 Vict. cc. 17, 30 (Partition Act and Settled Estates Act, 1876). With Explanatory Notes. Third Edition. By WILLIAM THOMAS CHARLEY, D.C.L., M.P., of the Inner Temple, Esq., Barrister-at-Law (late Exhibitioner of the Council of Legal Education).

London: H. SWERT, 3, Chancery-lane, Law Publisher.

PRACTICE AT JUDGES' CHAMBERS AND DISTRICT REGISTRIES.

Just published, post 8vo, price 10s., cloth.

THE PRACTICE OF THE JUDGES' CHAMBERS (Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions), and in the District Registries under the Supreme Court of Judicature Acts of 1873, 1875, and other Statutes; with an Appendix of the Judicature Acts, and the Rules and Orders to June, 1876. By WILLIAM E. COE, Principal Clerk to the Hon. Mr. Justice Lush.

London: H. SWERT, 3, Chancery-lane, Law Publisher.

Just published, price 6s. 6d., sewed.

THE STATUTES OF PRACTICAL UTILITY in the Civil and Criminal Administration of Justice passed 39 & 40 Victoria (1876). Alphabetically arranged, with notes thereon, and a copious index. By HORATIO LLOYD, Esq., Judge of County Courts (forming Vol. II., No. IV., of the Annual Continuation of Chitty's Statutes).

London: H. SWERT, 3, Chancery-lane; STEVENS & SONS, 118, Chancery-lane.

Price 3s., by post 3s. 2d.

DIVORCE.—THE LAW OF DIVORCE, SEPARATION, &c. By R. C. DEWY, Solicitor, 64, Mark-lane, London. "A clear statement of the law, well worth its price."—"Law Times."

LONGMANS & CO., PATERNOSTER-ROW.